Volume IX
umber 4
SEPTEMBER 1920

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

THE NEXT PRESIDENT'S LABOR RECORD

POLAND AND RUSSIA

COMMUNISTS ON TRIAL AND IN SECRET CONVENTION

AN INTERPRETATION OF FARMER-LABOR

DIVISIONS IN ITALIAN SOCIALISM

Contents

EDITORIAL NOTES

Russian-Polish Diplomacy. E. C. .....Page 117

Steel and the Interchurch. W. H. C. .....Page 118

"Open Shop." W. H. C....Page 119

Moscow and Geneva. L. S. G.....Page 119

The Communist Party in Secret Convention. H. W. L.....Page 120

British Labor and Direct Action. H. W. L. .....Page 124

THE CANDIDATES AND LABOR

Jessica Smith .....Page 125

THE COMMUNIST LABOR TRIAL

An Observer .....Page 130

THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY'S BIRTH

Arthur Warner .....Page 134

DIVISIONS IN ITALIAN SOCIALISM

Girolamo Valenti .....Page 137

SOCIALIST REVIEW CALENDAR

.....Page 140

BOOK REVIEWS

"Color in Everyday Life." By Louis Weinberg.....Page 143

"Socialism vs. Civilization." By Boris L. Brasol.....Page 144

"The Psychology of Nationality and Internationalism." By W. B. Pillsbury .....Page 144

"The Social Evolution of Religion." By George Willis Cooke .....Page 145

"The Casual Laborer and Other Essays." By Carleton H. Parker.....Page 146

'Is Violence the Way Out of Our Industrial Disputes?" By John Haynes Holmes .....Page 148

Our Contributors

FELIX GRENDON. Author of "Nixola of Wall Street." Member of the editorial board of *The Socialist Review.*

FRANK H. HANKINS. Professor of Sociology in Clark University.

ELLEN HAYES. Professor Emeritus of Astronomy in Wellesley College.

JESSIE W. HUGHAN. Author of "American Socialism of the Present Day," etc. Member of editorial board of *The Socialist Review.*

JESSICA SMITH. Executive Secretary of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society.

GIROLAMO VALENTI. General organizer of the Italian Chamber of Labor in New York.

ARTHUR WARNER. An associate editor of *The Nation.*

G. S. WATKINS. Assistant Professor of Economics in the University of Illinois.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. IX. SEPTEMBER 1920 No. 4

Russian-Polish Diplomacy

THE Russo-Polish war has cataclysmic possibilities for the future of the world. The social and economic forces that surge beneath the movements of troops along the Polish battle front and the bickerings of diplomats in London, Warsaw, and Petrograd are vastly more titanic than those which underlay the war with Central Europe. The alignment of capitalist world-imperialism over against working-class world-revolution dwarfs any issue involved in the Great War. And this is the issue between Warsaw and Moscow.

At the present writing (August 10th) the outcome of the immediate controversy between Russia and Poland is shrouded in complete uncertainty. Anything may happen. What does happen, however, can only be judged correctly when set in the perspective of what has gone before. Yet it is just that which is most likely to be lost sight of.

The background of the Russo-Polish controversy is, on the one hand, a continued repetition of offers of peace and concessions emanating from Petrograd and Moscow, addressed to the Polish and to the Allied governments; and, on the other, continued refusals by the Allies and Poland to enter negotiations—the Allies and Poland united in a conspiracy to crush the workers' republic of Russia by force of arms and starvation; Russia, indomitable, impregnable, fighting the world and fighting to success.

The thirty or so specific efforts of Russia to make peace with the Allies have been detailed with sufficient frequency to need no restatement here. The direct negotiations—or attempts at negotiation—between Russia and Poland are less generally understood. The briefest review is a sufficient commentary.

On February 3, 1918, Trotsky declared at the Brest-Litovsk conference that the Soviet government recognized "entirely and without restriction the independence of the Polish people and the Polish state." This has remained the underlying assumption of Soviet diplomacy from that day to this.

On February 17 and 19, 1919, the Soviet governments of White Russia and Lithuania proposed to the Polish Foreign minister an immediate peaceful settlement of the Russo-Polish boundary. On March 24th and April 15th, Soviet Foreign minister Chicherin offered to secure a settlement between Russia and Poland on the basis of plebiscites of the workers in the disputed territories. The advancing armies of Poland were the only answers to these attempted approachments.

On June 3rd, in a note protesting against pogroms committed by the Polish armies, Chicherin reiterated the desire of Russia for peace. On December 22nd, the Soviet government made a formal proposal "immediately to open negotiations aiming at a firm and lasting peace." No answer was received.

On January 28, 1920, the Council of People's Commissars transmitted a declaration to the Polish government and people stating that "there is every reason to believe that the efforts of the extreme imperialists of the Entente, partisans or agents of Churchill and Clemenceau, are at present directed to throwing Poland into an unjust, senseless, and criminal war against Soviet Russia." The note offered immediate negotiations for peace.

Poland's first answer to any of these notes was received four days later. "The declaration will be studied," it said, and "the reply communicated." The reply was a further Polish advance—an aggressive campaign against Ukraine.

A month later Chicherin again urged a peaceful settlement. Three weeks after that, on March 27th, Poland finally agreed to a preliminary conference for peace at Borisov, but suggested no general armistice. Russia answered with a request for the suspension of all hostilities during the negotiations, and some place in which to hold them further from the seat of military operations. Poland flatly refused both requests. Russia renewed her suggestion, mentioning even Warsaw as a possible location. Poland again refused.

Russia then appealed to the Allied governments to bring pressure on Poland to adopt a "more flexible" attitude. No attention was paid to this note.

The Polish armies advanced, and Russia, stiffening her defense, swung it into an offensive that now has almost reached the gates of Warsaw.

Soviet Russia made no less than eight offers of peace to Poland between February, 1919, and March, 1920. They were all ignored. Poland shattered the possibility of peace that arose in April by refusing a general armistice. During this period Polish armies had driven far into Russian territory, even beyond the boundaries fixed for Poland by the Entente Powers at the Peace Conference.

It is a commentary upon the motives and the methods of Allied diplomacy that in all this period of Polish aggression the Allied governments made no attempt to keep Russian territory inviolate, and that it was not until the Russian army crossed the Polish border and threatened Warsaw that they attempted to intervene in the interest of peace.

E. C.

Steel and the Interchurch

AT long last the Interchurch World movement has published the report of its investigation into the Steel Strike of nearly twelve months ago. After much adverse comment by liberal and radical journals on account of the delay in publication, this report of over 90,000 words is placed before the public as a book of some five hundred pages, published by Harcourt, Brace and Howe.

Advance proofs for the press show that its conclusions will be unpalatable to the great steel corporation, even at this long period after the strike has been called off. As might have been expected, the report finds, contrary to the columns of our metropolitan dailies, that the widespread charge of bolshevism behind the strike was utterly without foundation.

"The cry of bolshevism was not only a fraud on the public, it was a dangerous thing because . . . it raised in the minds of hundreds of thousands who know best that they are bolsheviks, a mistrust which abides and a suspicion of government agencies and of American public opinion which seemed to lend themselves to a campaign of misrepresentation."

So far from convicting William Z. Foster of starting the trouble with his little "red book," the Interchurch report places the immediate occasion of the strike on the shoulders of Elbert H. Gary, head of the United States Steel Corporation, who precipitated the conflict by refusing to confer with organized labor.

The report declares that conditions regarding the seven-day week are radically different from the impression given by Elbert Gary, while half the employes of the U. S. Steel Corporation are still subject to a compulsory twelve-hour day, though the eight-hour day exists as a basis for reckoning wages. Indeed, in the last ten years the daily hours of workers in the steel industry have been lengthened, not shortened. The control of the steel industry is said to be arbitrary and in the hand of financiers whose relations to the workers who actually produce the steel is remote. This arbitrary control, moreover, extends beyond the steel plants themselves and affects the workers as citizens and even the social institutions in the steel communities.

The cause of the strike, according to the report, "lay in grievances which gave the workers cause for complaint and action. *These unredressed grievances still exist in the steel industry.*" [Italics ours.]

All of which facts were already known to the workers, but for those who do not give credence to the columns of the New York *Call* or even *The Socialist Review,* this respectable body of the Interchurch now provides a source of information not obtainable in the "great" newspapers. W. H. C.

"Open Shop"

A SIGNIFICANT referendum vote by the members of the United States Chamber of Commerce was recently announced. The vote was taken on the report of a special committee of the Chamber's board of directors. The vote, which was the largest on record in the Chamber's history, stood at 1,665 in favor to 4 votes against the following principle of industrial relations:

"The right of open shop operation, . . . that is, the right of employer and employe to enter into and determine the conditions of employment relation with each other . . . is an essential part of the individual right of contract possessed by each of the other."

In other words, William Wood of the American Woolen company and some recent immigrant employe of one of his many textile mills must each possess the right of dealing with each other without participation of outside interests. That this would leave both parties to the resulting contract on even theoretical terms of equality is too ridiculous a conclusion for even the U. S. Chamber of Commerce to admit. The only meaning, therefore, that this overwhelming vote of the Chamber's members can have to the student of industrial relations is the patent failure of the 1,665 voters to recognize that the world has moved since the halcyon days of "involuntary servitude." W. H. C.

Moscow and Geneva

WHILE the columns of our newspapers were filled with the squabblings of the western statesmen at Spa, a conference which will figure larger still when the history of our days is written was in session at Moscow, almost unreported in the American press. It was the second congress of the Third International. A week later another congress opened at Geneva—that of the Second International.

Eighteen months ago the eyes of western socialists were turned to Berne—to the first post-war meeting of the Second International, in the desperate hope that it might give some relief from the machinations of the Paris Peace conference. Western socialists hardly noticed the birth at Moscow of a new organization. Today the situation is reversed. All eyes are turned to Moscow.

The leaders at Berne were the same men who were accused throughout the war of betraying their socialist consciences, and they were hamstrung by their own lack of positive socialist conviction. The handful of enthusiasts at Moscow, looking eagerly forward to world revolution and to a communist world, builded better than even they knew. The great socialist parties of continental Europe, carried leftward by the rising tide of communist enthusiasm, have swung out of the old Second International, and its Geneva sessions were but the funeral obsequies of an organization with a splendid past but with no future. Represented at this conference was the British Labor party, the Scheidemann wing of the German socialists (the men who supported the war), the Belgians, most conservative of all European socialist parties today, the Branting wing of the Swedish socialists, a little group of anti-bolshevist Russian exiles, and a few small groups from other countries. The French, the Italians, the Swiss, the Spanish, the Norwegians, the German Independents, and the Balkan socialists all stayed away. No one was there from America. And so far as we yet know the only positive action of the congress was to extol "democracy" and condemn bolshevism. England's revolution may follow such a track, but the workers of continental Europe have done with such hesitations. They hail the bolshevists as successful revolutionists, and they follow the sun of success.

Moscow has become the cynosure for the rest of the socialist world. We do not yet know what the conference at Moscow did—

except that it specifically included parliamentary methods as part of its revolutionary program—but we know the spirit in which it met. It was a spirit of triumphant jubilation at the success of the Red armies and at the final congregation of revolutionary socialists from all parts of the world—Koreans, Japanese, Chinese, Americans (Jack Reed, and probably others), Irishmen (Bernard McAlpine), Frenchmen, Germans, representatives of the British minority groups, Scandinavians, Balkans, Hungarians, Italians. Representatives of the growing, fighting, forward-pushing groups these, confident that the future was theirs.

The delegates of the French socialists went to observe, but were so stirred by what they saw that, before the conference opened, they telegraphed to Paris for permission to attend as delegates, saying that they believed adhesion to the Third International necessary. Their party wired them authorization to attend. There is none of the hesitation of Geneva here, none of the cautious clinging to outworn phrases. There is a tremendous confidence in the principles of the Russian soviet regime and in the doctrines of Russian communism. There are those who think its spirit sometimes too doctrinaire and too sectarian, too ready to exclude socialists still half-hearted in the communist faith. As it grows the Third International may outgrow that. This much is certain: that it is the live, growing International, the heart and center of the revolutionary movement of the world. L. S. G.

The Communist Party in Secret Convention

A FEW years ago American students of European affairs eagerly listened to tales of secret political conventions held by Russian revolutionists and were wont to pride themselves on their citizenship in a country where all political gatherings were held in the open. The last few years, however, have worked great changes and 1920 finds the situation reversed. One must now look to America for some of the most interesting examples of underground political parties and secret gatherings.

In the last issue of *The Socialist Review* the editor described the first secret political convention on a national scale held in America during the last few decades—the convention of the United Communist party, an amalgam of elements formerly found in the Communist and Communist Labor parties. At this secret gathering, held late in May, 1920, the three score delegates present congratulated each other on the fact that at last—after nearly a year of separation—the two communist groups had become unified. The tactics adopted at this convention appeared to the outsider as sufficiently extreme. The delegates gave the world to understand that they made "no pretence of legality" and that it was the duty of the U. C. P. "to familiarize the working class with the inevitability of armed force in the proletarian revolution."

Attack on United Communists

We are now informed that these tactics are far too mild for the majority of the old Communist party, and that nothing could induce this majority to join with the conservative membership of the U. C. P.

This at least was the attitude of the 34 delegates who attended the second convention of the Communist party of the United States—its first underground convention—held in late July in some unknown city of the United States. Judging from *The Communist*—the official underground organ of the party—these delegates, representative of over 8,000 members, spent most of their time proving how pink, how "centrist," the competing United Communist party "adventurers and charlatans" actually were. The charges of the Communist party against their competitor are many. They include the following:

1. The United Communists, while claiming to have induced a majority of the Communist party to join their ranks, took with them but 28 per cent of the C. P. membership. The former executive secretary of the C. P. therefore committed a fraud on the party by trans-

ferring to the newer organization the records and some $7,000 of funds of the C. P.

2. The platform of the United Communist party is not a communist platform. Chapter I on "The Collapse of Capitalism" reeks with "*. . . the bourgeois capitalist horror of the destruction of property and lives. . . .* There is no mention of proletarian revolution, or proletarian dictatorship, or mass action. Instead it talks of 'workers' rule which will save civilization —a typical bourgeois phrase. . . . The use of the term 'soviet rule under a working class dictatorship' shows a fundamental lack of understanding. . . . The soviet government is a form of proletarian dictatorship." (Italics editor's.)

3. The second chapter of the U. C. P. platform, according to *The Communist,* fails to state how the overthrow of capitalism is to be accomplished, considering force merely as a defensive weapon:

"That is the very crux of the difference between the Communist and Socialist parties, as well as the syndicalists and anarchists. . . . There is no mention of the capitalist state and the necessity for its destruction nor the manner of its destruction, as advocated by the Communist International, mass action culminating in armed insurrection and civil war. . . . *The U. C. P. considers the use of force as a purely defensive measure—not as an offensive measure* for which the communists must consciously prepare, and which is the highest expression of the class struggle. Here again the bourgeois horror of force emanates strongly from the U. C. P. camp." (Italics editor's.)

4. The U. C. P., to the distress of the communists, only intends to "familiarize" the workers with the "inevitability of armed force in the proletarian revolution," not to propagate or foster the use of force.

"The leaders [of the U. C. P.] never agreed with the communist position during the recent split. At that time they stated their opposition to the advocacy of the use of force and the inevitability of a violent revolution for the destruction of the capitalist state. They have not changed. They cannot change."

5. The Communist party further indicts its younger competitor on the ground, alas, that it is not a bona fide, dyed-in-the-wool, underground, illegal organization, and that some fine day, unless the membership show sufficient vigilance, they may wake up and discover that they have been fooled, that they don't belong to an illegal organization at all, that mere membership in the U. C. P. will no more guarantee a free pass to jail than will membership in the Republican or the Democratic party! The complete silence of the U. C. P.

" . . . on the question of an underground organization either in their program or constitution confirms the suspicion that the U. C. P. may eventually give up any pretension of being an illegal, underground party."

How is it possible to unite with the United Communists under these conditions? The delegates saw no possibility and stated so in no uncertain tones.

The Communists and the I. W. W.

6. The fact that the U. C. P. is flirting with that most conservative organization, the I. W. W., is a further cause for apprehension. The United Communists urge the organization of shop committees, to carry on "agitation for industrial unionism and against the A. F. of L." "What does this clause mean?" asks the horrified C. P. member. It can mean but one thing.

"The United Communist party . . . will act as a recruiting agency for the I. W. W.—the I. W. W. which has repudiated mass action, which has repudiated the dictatorship of the proletariat, which has repudiated soviet power. The I. W. W. which believes that communists who advocate and propagate the use of force against the state and the inevitability of a violent revolution are agents provocateurs! It seems as if the U. C. P. considers its primary task to propagate industrial unionism, and not communism, to the masses."

The U. C. P. program is thus, according to the C. P. convention,

"*a typical centrist document,* lacking both clearness and understanding of communism. Framed by unscrupulous phrase-jugglers, it evades the fundamental issues. Phrases like 'civil war,' 'armed insurrection,' and 'force' were mechanically inserted here and there, with no real intention of permitting such insertions to change the tone of the document." (Italics editor's.)

"One revolt [from the U. C. P.] has already begun—the Industrial or Independent Communist party—is even now in existence. The real communist elements who left the Communist party

due to misinformation, misrepresentation, and lies, will return to the Communist party. The centrist element will eventually unite with the left elements of the S. P. and blossom out as a real Centrist party, without any camouflage—with no underground pretensions, and an open organization."

Centralization

The convention, however, did not spend its entire time criticizing its weak brethren—the United Communists and the I. W. W. It consumed many hours in discussing the extent to which a well disciplined, revolutionary, underground political party should concentrate power in the national executive committee. One group felt that the organizers should be elected by the membership. Another insisted on appointment by the national executive committee. The arguments advanced by the believers in centralized control provide an interesting study in political psychology. We take the following from the official organ:

"Those who argued for appointments pointed out the necessity of building a highly centralized and well-disciplined underground organization in the face of the bitter persecution and suppression of the capitalist state, as well as the military character of the organization in the time of revolution, which would take the lead in destroying the highly centralized and armed capitalist state. That such a task required equally centralized organization and a *well-disciplined membership who would be able to carry out the orders of the supreme body without any hitch.* They pointed out that . . . it made for the safety of the underground organization against spies, who might otherwise gain the confidence of the membership and thus advance themselves to positions of trust in the party; . . . *that the time had come for the membership to sacrifice any remnant of petty-bourgeois psychology which militated against the acceptance of appointments for the sake of learning self-discipline;* that the membership were not in the party to raise their hands in voting as the highest expression of their duty, but to carry on communist propaganda, and agitation—to work—to build up the party, etc., etc." (Italics editor's.)

The group demanding election of organizers by the various groups believed "that elections would serve as a check upon the higher officials and give the membership some measure of control." A compromise was finally reached, whereby the central executive committee was to appoint the district and sub-district organizers, while the local organizers were to be elected by the branch organizers, the latter by the group captains, and the group captains by the groups.

Parliamentarism

A third question which caused moments of intense feeling was the attitude of the group toward parliamentarism. The Third International had vigorously criticized those communist groups who failed to use the parliamentary arm, as well as those who "renounced the effort to promote the revolutionary spirit of the labor unions from within."

Taking heed of this attitude, the communists voted down a minority resolution which declared that the party saw "no possibility of utilizing the parliamentary weapon either for the present or in the near future." They contented themselves with the statement that the use of the bourgeois parliament was "of secondary importance and for revolutionary propaganda and agitation only." "At the same time," the resolution continued, "due to political circumstances in the United States, the outlawing of our party and the prevailing reaction in this country, we are forced to boycott the coming elections."

Program

The foregoing gives a fair idea of the spirit of the convention. In general the program adopted by the delegates follows the lines of its first declaration, although it specifically includes in its definition of revolutionary mass action "armed insurrection and civil war." It describes the Communist party as "the revolutionary vanguard of the working class," and asserts that the party aims at "the destruction of the capitalist state and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of the Soviet government."

It advocates political action for propaganda purposes and mass action as a means of conquest. Mass action, the program asserts, develops as a spontaneous activity of the workers in basic industries, the mass strike being one of the initial forms. As

the strikes grow they acquire political character

" . . . by coming into direct conflict with the state which openly employs its machinery for breaking the strike and crushing the workers' organization. This culminates in armed insurrection and civil war aimed directly at the destruction of the capitalist state and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship."

The program criticizes the older unions as a bulwark of capitalism and declares that the concentration of industry is leading to an increase of machine workers, who constitute "the militant basis of the class struggle." The idea of industrial unionism gradually develops. Industrial unionism, however, while "a more efficient weapon of waging the struggle of the workers" than craft unionism, is not in itself revolutionary. It "cannot conquer the power of the state. It cannot train and mobilize the workers for the proletarian revolution."

The Proletarian State

Between the capitalist and communist society, the program goes on to state, there is a period of revolutionary transformation known as the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The proletarian state, like every state, is an organ of suppression and coercion, but this machinery is directed against the enemy of the working class. Its aim is to break the desperate resistance of the exploiters, who use all the power at their command to drown the revolution in blood; its aim is to make this resistance impossible. . . . When the resistance of the bourgeoisie is broken, when it is expropriated and gradually absorbed into the labor strata, all classes vanish, the proletarian dictatorship disappears, and the state dies out."

This analysis is followed by a denunciation of bourgeois democracy, under which "the masses . . . are totally deprived of real state administration." In conclusion the program ridicules the League of Nations and the Second or "yellow" International, and sings the praises of the Communist International.

"It is not a problem of immediate revolution. The revolutionary epoch may last for years. The Communist International offers a program both immediate and ultimate in scope. . . . The Communist International calls: Arms against arms. Force against force. Workers of the world, unite! All power to the workers!"

Thus ends the most revolutionary program ever adopted by a political party in America.

The Constitution

The constitution is similar in general to that adopted at the convention of the Communist party in September, 1919. In one respect, however, it is radically different: while the first constitution assumed that the communists could work as an open organization, the revised draft makes absolutely no such pretense. It reads in part:

"Article IV, Section 1: *The Communist party is an underground, illegal organization.* It is highly centralized, with the convention as its supreme body, and the central executive committee as its supreme body between conventions." (Italics editor's.)

"Article V, Section 10: The identity of the C. E. C. members shall not be made known, either by themselves or by those present at the convention."

"Article X, Section 1: The C. E. C. shall publish the official underground organ."

Slavic Membership

The delegates to the convention are described as workingmen, "veterans of the revolutionary movement both here and abroad. They knew their communism as well as their leaders, even though their mode of expression was difficult and clumsy, and their grasp of the English language was meagre."

The chief fact to be noted about the party membership is its Slavic character. The Lithuanian federation contributed 2,500 out of the 8,350 dues-paying members, according to the party's secretary; the Russian federation, 2,000; the Ukrainian, 1,500, and the Lettish, 1,000. Only about 500 members were said to have remained in the C. P. from among the English and non-federation language members, while the Polish, German, Hungarian, and Esthonian federations had evidently left the party as a unit. Before the raids of the federal government, the party claimed 26,680; after the raids, 12,740, and after the split, 8,350.[1]

[1] The following table of membership presented by the party secretary is of interest:

A Result of Suppression

The program and constitution of this simon-pure underground political group can be understood only in the light of its Slavic membership, of the recent revolutionary movements in Eastern Europe, and of the bitter persecutions by governmental officials and by industrial magnates. The proud boast of their members that they are the only real communists in this country and their biting denunciation of the unmitigated conservatism of the I. W. W. and of the United Communists have their humorous side, and fairly take the breath away from the American citizen accustomed to regard the I. W. W. as the most extreme type of social rebel.

An attempt may doubtless be made by many to justify the policy of suppression adopted by the government during the past year on the ground that this policy has accomplished a great diminution in communist membership. But the fact should not be overlooked that it has also assisted in the development of two secret political organizations of a more extreme type than any that has hitherto existed in this country—this at least should give American officialdom pause to consider whether it has attempted the best way to deal with the forces of industrial unrest.

H. W. L.

	Before Raids	After Raids	After Split	Went to U. C. P.
English (Incl. 800 Mich.)	1,900	700	300	300
Non-fed. Lang. members	1,100	400	200	200
Esthonian	280	140	...	140
German	850	500	...	350
Hungarian	1,000	...	...	...
Jewish	1,000	500	350	...?
Lettish	1,200	1,000	1,000	...
Lithuanian	4,400	2,500	2,500	...
Polish	1,750	1,000	...?	...?
Russian	7,000	3,000	2,000	1,000?
So. Slavic.....	2,200	1,000	...	1,000?
Ukrainian	4,000	2,000	1,500	500?
Totals.....	26,680	12,740	8,350	3,490

Note: These figures are the secretary's estimate. The report of the Secretary of the Russian Federation shows 2,600 paid members, and of the Secretary of the Ukrainian Federation 2,000 paid members.—*Ed. of Communist.*

British Labor and Direct Action

FOR many years British labor has talked much about the use of direct action for the purpose of preventing war. On August 9, 1920, at a conference representative of all branches of labor, it made this weapon an effective force against international conflict. It declared that a war between the allied powers and Soviet Russia "would be the most intolerable crime in history," and *"warns the government that the whole industrial power of the organized workers will be used to defeat this war."* (Italics editor's.) Lloyd George's apology two days later is sufficient proof of the power of this threat.

The first week in August furnished the labor world in Great Britain with another event of dramatic interest: the decision of the recently formed British Communist party to seek affiliation with the British Labor party. This action was said to have been strongly urged by Lenin himself, and is unique in the history of Communism.

H. W. L.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Published Monthly by the

INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Editor, HARRY W. LAIDLER. Wesleyan.
Managing Editor, W. HARRIS CROOK. Oxford.
Business Manager, MARIAN TYLER. Oberlin.

Editorial Board

JAMES W. ALEXANDER.....Princeton
EVANS CLARK .....Amherst
H. W. L. DANA.....Harvard
LEWIS S. GANNETT.....Harvard
FELIX GRENDON .....Columbia
JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.....Barnard
WINTHROP D. LANE.....Michigan
F. F. ROCKWELL.....Wesleyan
ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG .....Trinity

Contributing Editors

Louis B. Boudin, Stuart Chase, Arthur Gleason, Freda Kirchwey, John Haynes Holmes, Florence Kelley, Bruno Lasker, Caro Lloyd, James H. Maurer, Wm. P. Montague, S. Nuorteva, James Oneal, Harry A. Overstreet, Vida D. Scudder, Charles P. Steinmetz, Norman M. Thomas, Louis Untermeyer, and Savel Zimand.

The Candidates and Labor

Jessica Smith

Senator Harding

WHEN Senator Harding received the suffragists at Marion, he pointed with pride to the fact that he had voted for suffrage, saying, "A vote records a senator's purpose as faithfully as anything he may do." So far, he has carefully refrained from pointing with pride to his labor record. He has confined himself to promises that the rights of union labor will receive the most serious attention at his hands if he is elected, leaving it to Will Hays to declare that "Harding has never cast a vote in either the Ohio state legislature, or as United States senator in Washington, that was not dictated by his love for the people."

It is difficult to determine from his speech of acceptance whether Harding is more concerned over the good fortune of the wage earner or the protection of the public from strikes. There is no such ambiguity, however, in his actual voting record. Whenever forced to show his colors, he has sided with the most reactionary element. Penrose and Lodge have been his leaders. But he lacks their astuteness.

The *Searchlight* for August contains a thorough analysis of Harding's record in the Senate from official documents available at Washington. It shows that on every important test between capital and labor, Harding has sided with capital, and on important measures he has followed progressive leadership only nine times in six years. He has voted for the liquor interests thirty times, against them only twice, has opposed public ownership and extension of government control in every form, and has stood consistently against every amendment on revenue measures to increase the tax on profiteering and large incomes.

Harding's Labor Record

On specific measures affecting labor directly, the *Searchlight* cites the following most significant examples of Harding's attitude:

(1) He failed, in December, 1919, to vote on a motion to strike out the section of the Cummins bill making it a criminal offense to strike. On final passage he voted for the bill containing the anti-strike provision. In February, 1920, he was paired in favor of the Esch-Cummins bill as finally passed, which shackled labor with its provisions for compulsory arbitration, legalized billions of dollars' worth of watered stock, and guaranteed profits to the owners out of the public pocketbook.

(2) In 1917 he voted against appropriating $500,000 to establish an employment bureau in the Department of Labor.

(3) The Borland amendment to the Agricultural Appropriation act of 1919 proposed that employes of the Agricultural department of the District of Columbia be required to work eight hours instead of seven. Harding voted for compulsory lengthening of the working day.

(4) Following Lodge in September, 1919, he voted for a minimum wage law for the District of Columbia. But in the last session of Congress, when friends of the measure were trying to get action, he voted to displace it by the bill raising the pay of postal employes, so that there are still some 66,000 federal employes receiving less than the three dollar minimum proposed.

(5) At least six times during Harding's term the Tavenner amendment to the Naval Appropriation bill prohibiting stop-watch and bonus systems in the navy yards has come to a vote. Each time he has voted to strike out the prohibition, thus declaring himself in favor of labor-driving devices. He also opposed an amendment granting navy yard and arsenal employes thirty days annual leave without loss of pay.

(6) He voted to amend the proposed civil service retirement law by requiring employes to contribute from 3 per cent to 8 per cent of their salaries toward a pension fund, rather than putting the entire cost on the government.

(7) At the height of war congestion in the District of Columbia Harding voted against a report

providing a district rent administrator to prevent rent profiteering, which was affecting thousands of workers and government employes.

(8) He voted No on the proposal to amend the revenue act raising the pay of soldiers to $50 a month.

Other Issues

Of equal import to labor are other national and international issues which have an important effect on living conditions of workers as citizens. Harding favored the Shields Water Power bill forced through by the special interests, and has in no instance stood for conservative measures. He opposed the appointment of Louis D. Brandeis to the Supreme Court bench.

Even during the war, Harding showed a distrust of governmental regulation and preferred to leave business matters in the hands of the profiteers. He opposed the wire control bill, and the establishment of a government armor plate factory, and favored the continuance of the private manufacture of munitions. On military affairs, he supported conscription as a permanent policy. He believes in a large navy and a large standing army, with compulsory military training, and is opposed to universal disarmament and a war referendum as a peace policy. He was opposed to the abolition of secret sessions in the Senate and to the open consideration of secret treaties. He has always held a narrowly nationalistic attitude, and has fought self-determination wherever the issue appeared. His attitude on the treaty is well known.

Harding's few constructive votes make a negligible showing when compared with this record. He favored woman suffrage, but only reluctantly, under party pressure. In June, 1918, he inconsistently voted against the strangling of the Child-Labor bill.

Harding was absent when the Adamson law was voted on, but his attitude was unmistakable from editorials in his paper at the time, which stigmatized it as a prelude to revolution. In December, 1919, in addressing the Cleveland Builder's exchange, Mr. Harding was quoted by the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* as saying that the country was in greater peril today than in the Civil War, or in 1917. Shaking his finger at the audience, and leaning far over the speaker's table, he said:

"The first wedge was driven under the pillar of this republic in the Adamson law of 1916. That was, to a degree, the beginning of radicalism in America. Of course, it was the result of a bad situation; it was the mistaken effort to placate a class. But there is absolutely no place in our republic for any class leadership."

Selected quotations from Harding's speeches as senator and as presidential candidate might make light reading for a summer afternoon. But further examples should not be necessary to prove the calibre of the man who has been chosen to rescue the country from the evils of the Wilson administration.

Cox as a Legislator

The outstanding fact about the legislation initiated by the Democratic candidate, James M. Cox, during his term of office in Washington is that he was particularly concerned with bills for private pensions. His congressional career was strikingly similar to Harding's in this respect. During his six years in the Senate, Harding's output was 130 bills of a private nature to 9 of a public character. Of these 139, 87 dealt with pensions, the remainder with such matters as the relief of sundry building and loan associations in Ohio, and the changing of the names of steamships. Cox was even more aggressive in advocating a liberal governmental pension policy. His contribution to the legislative hopper of the House amounted to 829 bills, 815 private, and 14 public. Of the entire number, 779 were concerned with pensions! There is little in Cox's congressional record that has any significance on labor questions. His claim to labor's support after four years of unparalleled opportunity, rests entirely on his part in securing the establishment of the Children's bureau, and the introduction of a bill to regulate the employment of children in the District of Columbia. The tariff was the main question before the House during his two terms. Cox

opposed high protectionism, at the same time seeking to show that he was not a free trader.

Cox as Governor

As Governor of Ohio, Cox has made certain rather noisy gestures to win the support of labor, but on close scrutiny there is little of actual accomplishment to be found in his record. He has contented himself with the phraseology rather than the acts of liberalism. His gubernatorial career has been characterized by occasional vigorous agitation over such problems as the High Cost of Living. On one occasion he called together the county prosecutors of Columbus to instruct them to get after the profiteers, without even taking the Department of Justice into his confidence. No convictions were ever secured, to be sure, but Cox strengthened his reputation as a friend of the working people.

Cox wisely made himself "solid" with conservative labor leaders in the first few months of his administration in 1913, and, according to newspaper reports, has remained so ever since. Curiously enough, he has also managed to stay on the best of terms with the business interests of the state. None of them have ever actively or openly opposed him, while many important leaders of big business have supported him. His first act as Governor was to call a special session of the state legislature, at the behest of William Green of the United Mine workers, then Democratic leader of the state senate, in order to put through the "Mine-Run" law. This law was favored by the miners, as it made compulsory the payment of wages by mine-run instead of a graduated scale of wages determined by the condition of the coal mined. Throughout his administration he has defended the Workmen's Compensation law passed during his first term. In office he succeeded in raising the age limit for children's work, and in restricting the working hours for women and children. Failure to carry out campaign promises of minimum wage legislation for women is attributed by his friends to lack of data. It seems that Governor Cox recommended the formation of a committee to investigate the problem, but evidently considered the recommendation sufficient in itself to square him with labor, for it was never carried out.

Fortunately for Cox, all the big strikes have been decided outside of Ohio, and, never having been definitely confronted with the solution of any important industrial disputes, he has been able to maintain his popularity with both labor and capital by a policy of "hands off." During the steel strike Cox maintained a more liberal attitude than did his neighbor in Pennsylvania, bidding for the support of labor by allowing meetings of the strikers which were prohibited just across the border.

It is significant that the distraction of war and after-the-war problems prevented the enactment of any economic legislation in Ohio. At a time of unprecedented need for a broad program of social reconstruction, Cox has contented himself with a few reformist measures. Actually, he has not scratched the surface of the labor problem. He has no definite policies, trying always to adjust himself to the current of events. His political opponents are accusing him of having opposed the war before our entry, with an eye on the German votes of Ohio. But he became a strong supporter as soon as it was declared, and talked a great deal about Americanism. On one occasion, in speaking before the schools, he is reported to have urged the children of foreign families to report to the authorities any seditious utterances made by their parents.

When Governor Cox, during the present campaign, went to Washington to confer with President Wilson, he was the guest of the Honorable Timothy Ansberry, ex-congressman from Ohio and attorney and lobbyist for the whiskey interests before the Treasury Department and Congress. Ansberry lavishly entertained Cox, and the newspapers made much of their social activities. Such a public advertisement of his friendship for the friend of the whiskey interests would seem to indicate that, if the Democratic platform

is neutral, its candidate is not. He has also been identified with the promotion of public utility corporations.

And now, as the candidate of the party that has jailed, deported, and muzzled the workers, while allowing the profiteers to rage unchecked, Governor Cox is holding out great promises to labor. His solution for industrial disputes is for the President to appoint a commission, and to let the findings of that commission be made known. "Upon this evidence," he says, "public opinion will be formed. It can be depended on to be fair. It will always be dominant." But he does not suggest any method of applying the findings of public opinion. And what about the findings of previous commissions?

While the attitude of Cox has been less flagrantly reactionary than that of Harding, there is actually little to choose between the two candidates. Both stand for the continuance of the present profit system, wherein the few gain enormous wealth, while the many receive but a subsistence wage. The platforms of both are in essence alike, having repudiated even the mild demands of organized labor. Their speeches of acceptance and their campaign statements differ in but minor particulars.

Both, for instance, theoretically approve of collective bargaining. Harding emphatically denies the right to strike against the government, however, and argues that the exercise of the right of collective bargaining "must not destroy the equally sacred right of the individual in the necessary pursuit of his livelihood"—a declaration which may be interpreted as favoring the open shop. Cox, in a more veiled statement, declares that "neither labor nor capital should at any time or in any circumstances take action that would put in jeopardy the public welfare." The public pays its money and takes its choice.

Christensen, Farmer-Labor Candidate

When Parley P. Christensen lifted his six feet four out of the delegate's seat he occupied at the convention of the Committee of Forty-eight, it was to become the dominating figure, and a few days later the Presidential candidate of the Farmer-Labor party which emerged from the conventions described elsewhere in this issue. It is doubtful whether he would have won so much prominence had it not been for his physical bulk. He was the only person who could manage the crowd. But it needed more than mere size to gain the confidence of that body. It needed his enthusiasm and warm-heartedness, his whole-souled belief in this new groping thing that wanted to be the political expression of labor, his roseate vision of what could be accomplished by the group gathered there, in spite of dissensions and muddleheadedness in their ranks.

Previous to the convention, Christensen was practically unknown in the labor world. His actual labor record is very scant. He was originally a republican in politics. Through the successive stages of progressivism and Wilsonian democracy, he has become finally a vigorous partisan of the workers, so that he is now able to accept the class-conscious program of the new party without reservation. As an attorney in Utah, Christensen's first service to the labor movement was the enforcement of the local eight-hour law in mines and municipal works. More recently he has defended I. W. W.'s and has thwarted the Labor department in a deportation or two. Christensen was formerly a member of the News Writers' union and a delegate to the Salt Lake City Central body. On the whole, this experience seems rather inadequate as a preparation to tackling the complex problems confronting the new party.

Debs.

On the other hand, the labor record of Eugene V. Debs, candidate for the fifth time of the Socialist party of the United States, is inextricably woven into his life. It seems presumptuous to pick out here and there certain incidents and to give them as the "labor record" of the man who has dedicated his life to the workers, who more than any one else in America represents their aims and ideals, and embodies their revolt.

In 1870, at the age of 14, Debs went to work in the railroad shops. At sixteen he was firing freight for the Terre Haute and Indianapolis Railway. Two years later, he gave up railroading, for the sake of his mother, and took a clerkship in a grocery store, remaining there until he was elected city clerk of Terre Haute.

Debs first came into the organized labor movement in 1875 with the organization of the local lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen at Terre Haute. Previous to that time he had helped to organize the Brotherhood of Railroad Brakemen, the Switchmen's Mutual Aid Association, the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, the Order of Railway Telegraphers, and other labor unions.

The American Railway Union

At the Buffalo convention in 1878, the Brotherhood showed their confidence in Debs by making him associate editor of the Firemen's magazine. Two year's later, he was appointed grand secretary and treasurer of the Brotherhood and editor and manager of the magazine. He worked indefatigably for the organization, giving his whole energy to the cause. He succeeded in wiping out a debt of $6,000 and adding 226 new lodges.

It was becoming increasingly clear to Debs at this time that labor could gain little of permanent value when organized along craft lines. The Railroad Managers' association was creating factionalism among employes, and keeping down wages, by playing the several organizations against each other. With the gradual merging of the smaller roads into the larger ones, Debs came to the conclusion that industrial unionism was the only logical step. He resigned his position, over the protests of the Firemen, and, in June, 1893, organized the American Railway Union in Chicago, giving up his salary of $4,000 a year, for $75 a month.

On April 13, 1894, came the strike of the Great Northern railroad, which Debs led to a victorious conclusion in eighteen days, without violence or bloodshed. The workers, who had been receiving miserable wages, gained 97% of their demands. This was one of the first big victories of organized labor in America.

Debs Becomes Socialist

Two months later the Pullman workers determined to strike. Debs counseled arbitration, but the managers refused to deal with the union, and the A. R. U. went out in sympathy. It was during this strike which spread throughout the country that Debs was indicted with four other officials, on the charge of conspiracy to obstruct the mails. No conviction could be secured. A second charge of contempt of court was brought against them, because of alleged violation of the restraining injunction, which made it a crime to use even persuasion on workingmen to join a strike! On this charge, Debs and his associates were finally sent to Woodstock jail for six months.

In jail, Debs read extensively and came to the conclusion that the working class could only achieve victory by working in concert industrially and politically. He left jail a socialist. Since then he has constantly written and spoken for the labor movement.

His greatest service of all is the sacrifice he is making today behind the bars of Atlanta, refusing to consider pardon or release that does not include his comrades who are likewise imprisoned for their political beliefs.

The purpose of Debs and of the party which he represents, can best be described in his own words:

"To free the workers of the world from the curse of wage slavery and its countless brood of festering evils, to reorganize society upon a basis of coöperative industry in which all shall be workers, owning in common the machinery of production and producing wealth for their own enjoyment, is the prime object of the International Socialist movement.

"What workingman, unless his brain has been extinguished in wage slavery, can fail to understand that the Socialist party is his party as against the Republican party, the Democratic party, and all other capitalist parties, because it is the only party that stands for his class, the only party whose mission it is to organize this class for the overthrow of wage slavery and the emancipation of the workers from capitalist tyranny and misrule."

The Communist Labor Trial

An Observer

EVERYBODY except Jack Carney was surprised at the verdict by which the jury in Chicago on August 2 sentenced twenty members of the Communist Labor party to prison. Carney, one of the defendants, said:

"I've been 'successfully indicted' so often since the war started that I can't imagine any verdict except guilty."

But to the others, accused and spectators alike, the conviction was unexpected, for the following reasons: Mr. Darrow had been successful in his defense of Persons in the Rockford trial, the only previous case argued under the Illinois "Overthrow Statute." The defense had exposed, as an incident of the trial, the "slush fund" of $40,000 provided by Chicago business men to enable the state's attorney to conduct his New Year raids and these prosecutions. Extreme care had been observed in the selection of the jury. The prosecution had introduced but scant material evidence. The defense had not been conducted as in a "propaganda case." Every legal technicality had been taken advantage of by William S. Forrest, William A. Cunnea and Clarence Darrow, counsel for defense.

The case opened on May 10. It was July 8 before a full jury had been selected from the two thousand veniremen examined. It was a jury predominantly of workingmen, among others a locomotive engineer, the proprietor of a union printshop, an auto-mechanic, a bill collector, a clothing measurer. Despite this fact, the verdict, returned on August 2, was reached in a few hours, and from certain circumstances it may be inferred that more time was consumed in writing the verdict than in reaching it.

The Court

The Court may be disposed of with brevity equal to the foregoing treatment of the jury. Mr. Forrest in his arguments challenged Judge Oscar Hebel to emulate Judge Anderson of Boston, to make this case historic by reason of its liberal interpretation of the statute. Judge Hebel, however, evidently preferred to allow the verdict to be the only thing worthy of the notice of posterity. He himself was a "stalwart." Eight material questions were argued during the trial; in each instance the ruling of the Court was "regular."

Because of his Honor's rulings, evidence found its way into the record which seemed to indicate that either Lenin and Trotzky or the executive committee of the Seattle general strike were on trial. The state first introduced documentary evidence: transcriptions of speeches and photographs of letters by William Bross Lloyd; copies of pamphlets, magazines, posters and badges inscribed with Russian insignia, taken in the raid on Arthur Proctor's bookstore; a red flag found in Edgar Owen's room; statements made to officials after the raids by Owens, Max Bedacht and L. E. Katterfeld; the platform and program of the Communist Labor party; the manifestoes of the old left wing of the Socialist party and of the Third International.

General Strike Outlawed

In the left wing document appears this statement:

"Strikes are developing which verge on revolutionary action, and in which the suggestion of proletarian dictatorship is apparent, the strike-workers trying to usurp functions of municipal government, as in Seattle and Winnipeg."

This was the excuse for the admission of evidence concerning the general strike over the objection of Mr. Forrest. This evidence gave the case a larger significance than had previously adhered to it. *The general strike became the principal issue, and the verdict, for the first time in the history of American jurisprudence, outlawed this form of industrial activity.*

Arguing for the admission of this testimony, Frank Comerford, special prosecutor, promised that the state would show that the Seattle and Winnipeg affairs were without the sanction of official organized labor, and that their aims were revolutionary; that, in Seattle, a Soldiers', Sailors' and Workmen's council had been formed on the plan of the Russian soviets to aid by force the proposed establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat; that citizens had been starved into submission and forced into the soup-kitchens of the strikers; that babies and inmates of hospitals had suffered for lack of milk; that a great city had been deprived of its public utilities and that crime and lust had stalked the unlighted streets.

The state promised much. The evidence was admitted. What did it actually prove? Not a word was introduced concerning the strike in Winnipeg—possibly because of the poor showing in relation to the testimony regarding Seattle. An ex-soldier named Wilson was the first witness to testify concerning the Seattle strike. He admitted that he was a spy employed by the Minute Men, an organization whose purpose was to perform in peace time the functions of the American Protective league. As such, he became an organizer for the Soldiers,' Sailors' and Workmen's council. This body, he declared, had been formed to provide relief and employment for discharged service men. Some $60,000 had been collected for that purpose among the Seattle unions. Most of it, he alleged, had been spent for strike propaganda.

The general strike, he conceded, had grown out of the strike of shipyard workers who demanded an increase of 10 per cent. in wages. Its real intent, however, was revolutionary. He quoted from speeches he had heard, made by officials of unions, to prove that forceful and violent methods had been urged for the capture of industry and government. He even went so far as to say that he had seen revolvers extracted from lunch-baskets carried to strike headquarters.

Ole Hanson

All this prepared the way for Ole Hanson, former mayor of Seattle, at present a "star" attraction of the Chautauqua bureaus. For the most part his testimony described conferences he had had with leaders of the strike. His principal interest at the outset was to keep the public utilities in operation. Several members of the strike committee, he said, had threatened to shut down the municipal electric plant. He admitted that this had not been done but—herein was the heinous offense—the motive of the strikers had not been to comply with his authority, but to placate public opinion. A similar situation developed in the case of the telephone system, as he presented it; the strikers needed the 'phones for their own business. Restaurants and milk stations had been opened by the committee, but they were insufficient in number to provide for the entire population. During the strike he had seen a funeral in which the hearse had borne an "exemption card." This, and a score of outrageously revolutionary quotations from various unionists, was the burden of Mr. Hanson's complaint.

James Duncan Testifies

Then the state closed. That was all that had been realized of Mr. Comerford's lurid promises!

James Duncan, secretary of the Seattle Central Labor council, was the principal witness for the defense. He was on the stand two days; the substance of his testimony is as follows:

The general strike was a sympathetic strike in support of the shipyards walkout. Its sole object was to force the owners to share with their employes the cost-plus profits which the government had guaranteed. To say that it had been intended as a means of confiscating property was foolish. The mayor's statements that its intent was to emulate Russia were lies. (The Court severely reprimanded the witness for this statement.) To substantiate his interpretation of the strike as a demonstration and protest, the witness stated that he and others had proposed to limit its duration. This limitation would, in fact, have been effected had not the mayor proclaimed martial law. This action prolonged the strike.

All threats of force had been made by the mayor and members of the Chamber of Commerce. The Soldiers', Sailors' and Workmen's council had no representation on the strike executive committee, the Veteran Guards being the only ex-soldiers actively engaged in the conduct of the strike. They had been instructed under no circumstances to use violence. Less crime than usual had occurred during the strike-period. No important utilities had been withdrawn from the citizens. Telephones had been operated because the girls had been on strike a short time previous and could not afford to go out again. Electricity and gas were provided as usual because a committee of workers had reported that to close these plants would probably bring suffering to inmates of the hospitals.

Swenson, a union printer from Seattle, followed Duncan, and corroborated his testimony. The last witness was Mrs. Viola G. Crahan, modest, white-haired, moderate, the chairman of the civics committee of the Seattle Woman's club. She contradicted the sworn statements of Mayor Hanson. She had seen the Veteran Guards; none of them had been armed, but she had heard them politely ask little groups to disperse in order that there might be no possible provocation to disorder. She had spent eight hours a day investigating the entire situation in order to report fully to her civics committee, but she had found no one suffering for want of food or of any other necessity.

Forrest for the Defense

With this, the trial came to its last stage. It would be superfluous to produce abstracts of the six days of argument on both sides. But any account of the case would be inadequate, that did not at least indicate the extraordinarily elaborate and learned plea of Mr. Forrest. He, the avowed "anti-bolshevik," the admitted dean of criminal lawyers of Illinois, defending these "reds," was surely the "human interest feature" of the trial. And his argument is important in that it provides the only hope that the verdict may be reversed by a superior court.

Mr. Forrest began on this highly class-conscious strain:

"So far as I'm concerned, I'm for the flag. I'm against socialism, against bolshevism. But Mr. Lloyd asked me to defend him on the ground that he had not violated the law. I accepted the case on that basis. After I got into it, when I reviewed the history of the sedition legislation of 1798, when I reviewed treason cases in England and the trials of Socrates and of Jesus, then I came to the conclusion that, by defending this case, I could do a service, not only to Mr. Lloyd, but also to this country for which my blood had fought and will fight again with pride."

The attorney continued:

The *Revolutionary Age,* containing reference to the general strike, as well as evidence concerning the strike itself, should be eliminated from the testimony, as it was published prior to July 1, 1919, when the Illinois Overthrow statute went into effect. . . . The Seattle strike was an overt act. Defendants were not being prosecuted for commission of an overt act, but for advocacy of subversive doctrine. No overt act could properly be admitted unless it tended *to effect* the conspiracy. At most, this evidence would tend *to enlarge* it, if it were proved to have existed. . . . The platform and program of the Communist Labor party does not show that defendants adopted the Seattle strike as a model for their own plans; their references to it are only historical and prophetic. . . .

But even if the general strike *were* their method, there is nothing unlawful in that. A strike, general or otherwise, is legal. An unlawful purpose does not make an otherwise legitimate act illegal. When Reuf and Schmidt, in San Francisco, tried to prevent restaurant-keepers from having their licenses reviewed because of a refusal to give bribes, their efforts at prevention were held to be legal. The fact that these efforts were part of a blackmail scheme was held not to make them illegal. . . . Moreover, the ends of the Seattle strike were not unlawful, nor are those of the defendants. Their object is the overthrow of the capitalist system of industrial control, not of the government. "Is the state trying to identify the government with the capitalist class?"

The defense wants to know what this law means. In the opinion of the defense, the legislature which passed it did not know its meaning. "This law was drafted by a man who had lost his legal compass, to please the people who paid him to do it—as they paid legislatures in twenty states to pass similar laws." Therefore, this case is history-making; from it must result an authoritative interpretation of the Overthrow statute. . . . The purpose of the statute must be taken to be the prevention of the advocacy or commission of treason to the end that the government may be overthrown. Treason has always consisted exclu-

sively of physical and forcible acts. It is self-evident that no government or form of government in this country can be unlawfully reformed or overthrown except by force and violence. (This was the kernel of the whole argument; for by this time the state realized that it would be unable to prove "force and violence," and relied strongly upon the phrase, "or any other unlawful means," holding that the general strike was included in those words. The state contended that it meant "any other means than that prescribed by the Constitution," that is, by the method of constitutional amendment.)

It cannot be held that the legislature intended "any other unlawful means" to signify "other means than that provided in the constitution," for the following reasons: 1. The words, "any other unlawful means," do not aptly express such intent. The legislature would have been more specific had it intended the meaning which the state assumed. 2. "Unlawful means" is never taken to mean, "not authorized by any other law." It should be construed as an act prohibited by some specific law. 3. Especially in criminal law, the offense to be punishable must be within the letter as well as within the spirit of the law. 4. To interpret the phrase in the sense suggested by the state would be to make crimes by construction. 5. While the constitution provides a method for its own amendment, it provides no legal method for its overthrow.

Furthermore, no other than forcible methods are "apparently suitable" to the object of this conspiracy, if there be a conspiracy. This, again, indicates that "any other unlawful means" must mean forcible or violent methods, since the law could not be concerned with prohibiting attempts which, on their face, are ridiculously futile. . . . Finally, there is a rule of interpretation which instructs that "when two or more words are coupled together, the more general is restricted to a sense analogous to the less general." And in this case, "any other unlawful means" is more general than "force and violence" and hence must be restricted in its interpretation.

From the platform Mr. Forrest read, "The Communist Labor party declares itself in complete accord with the principles of communism as laid down in the manifesto of the Third International formed in Moscow. In essence these principles are as follows:"—and maintained that the organization was not committed to bolshevik policies any further than as specified in the eight particulars then enumerated. He explained that the defense had introduced the party constitution to show that members had paid dues of 50 cents a month, and declared that it was ridiculous to try to start a revolution on so slight a financial basis.

For the rest, his statements were apologies for his clients. Mr. Forrest represented only Mr. Lloyd and Dr. Karl Sandburg. His tactics were resented bitterly by the "left wing" of the group whose liberties were at stake. These were represented by Mr. Darrow. But there was little of scientific communism in his debate; there was instead superb oratory. To Mr. Darrow may be applied a term no longer, as once, honored among radicals: he is the Last of the Libertarians in the United States.

The Prosecution

The calibre of the state's rebuttal may be indicated by this incident in the closing address of Mr. Comerford. Throwing down a state's exhibit, Edgar Owens' red flag, the state's attorney trampled upon it, shouting, "I care not if this be sedition to your damned red rag. I have but one flag, that one"—pointing to the stars and stripes hanging behind the bench. This moment was typical of the three days consumed by Messrs. Comerford, Barnhart and Heth.

It is difficult, and perhaps superfluous, to predict what the verdict in this case may portend. Certainly, if it stands, it bodes ill for future attempts at the general strike—which is regarded by many as the one possible pacifist mode of revolution. With equal certainty, it renders ridiculous the Communist Labor party's theory of an organization at once legal and revolutionary; and it gives a sinister dignity to the new "underground" movement, the United Communist party, which is now being investigated by the grand jury of Cook county. And for the near future, this victory of the state's attorney means the prosecution of the eighty-odd members of the Communist party and the thirty-some I.W.W. who were arrested with these convicted men in the New Year raids.

The Farmer-Labor Party's Birth

Arthur Warner

SO much confusion exists in regard to what happened at the various meetings in Chicago where the Farmer-Labor party was born in July that a summary of events should precede any discussion of them.

The Committee of Forty-eight met in national convention in a Chicago hotel on July 10 and the American Labor party began sessions a day later in Car Men's hall. A number of delegates were accredited to both conventions, and a substantial proportion of the farmers in both bodies were members of the National Nonpartisan league, attending unofficially, since that organization concerns itself only with state politics and cannot, as now constituted, take sides in a national campaign. The situation was further complicated by the presence in both conventions of members of the Single Tax party and other organizations, hopeful of combining in a powerful single movement, or at least of propagandizing for their cause.

Overtures were begun directly to bring the Labor party and the Committee of Forty-eight together, but a joint committee on platform could not agree, and on July 13 the Labor party announced that at 2 p. m. it would proceed to the adoption of a platform and the nomination of candidates without further regard to union. Under this spur the rank and file of the Forty-eight convention took matters out of the hands of their leaders, voted to join forces with the Labor party, and marched in a body to Car Men's hall, where they were enthusiastically received and seated. Thereafter a platform was adopted, the name Farmer-Labor party was chosen, and Parley P. Christensen and Max Hayes were nominated, respectively, for President and Vice-President of the United States.

On July 15, after the adjournment of the Farmer-Labor convention, a group of dissatisfied Forty-eighters, fairly characterized as a "rump parliament," gathered again at their original headquarters, and passed a resolution disassociating themselves in a veiled way from the action of the joint convention. Subsequently J. A. H. Hopkins, Allen McCurdy, and certain other leaders specifically repudiated the Farmer-Labor party. The newspapers of the country also generally heralded as a repudiation an announcement from the headquarters of the Nonpartisan league that it would not affiliate or merge with the new party, but this, in truth, was merely a restatement of the fact that the existing organization of the league prevented it, officially, from taking sides in any national contest.

Contending Forces

So much for the skeleton of facts. Now what of the flesh and blood and breath that made it live? There were two great forces at work, running counter to each other. The first, tending toward disunion, resulted from disagreement in regard to platform between the political reformers, on the one hand, and the economic reconstructors, on the other. In current phraseology these groups may be more briefly described as liberals and radicals, respectively, although the radicalism was mild according to socialist standards. The liberals were concerned chiefly with the restoration of civil rights; the radicals were equally insistent upon this, but they felt that in order to have a free citizen it was necessary first to have a free worker.

The second great force in evidence was a desire on the part of an undoubted majority of the rank and file to persuade Senator La Follette to be their candidate for President. This worked for solidarity, and proved just enough the stronger to hold all elements together as long as the La Follette candidacy was a possibility. The moment that La Fol-

lette's name was definitely withdrawn, the liberals and the radicals inevitably fell asunder. The whole story of what happened at Chicago centered around these facts.

It is a mistake to assume—as many seem to have done—that those who favored a program primarily of political reform were all in the ranks of the Forty-eighters while the demand for an economic attack came solely from the Labor party. This was broadly true of the leaders on both sides, however, and they were the determining factor in the decisions on platform that were finally reached. The La Follette sentiment, on the other hand, was essentially of the rank and file, and apparently pretty evenly distributed among both groups. It was especially strong among the farmers.

What, in the popular mind, identified the Forty-eighters as the right and the Labor delegates as the left of the joint convention was the report of the platform committee. This was presented as a majority report—concurred in by all five of the Labor members of the committee, and at least one of the Forty-eighters' representatives—and as a minority report signed by three of the Forty-eighters. This action occurred just after word had been received virtually eliminating La Follette as a candidate, and, with the amalgam removed, the convention resolved itself at once into a simple issue between left and right, in which the former won on the vote, the majority report prevailing by 308 to 125.

In point of fact the vote was not on the respective platforms, but on the men who sponsored them. In essentials the majority and minority platforms were so nearly akin that there was little choice between them. Both were far too long and complicated to be adequately understood or even heard upon a single reading in a large hall. A majority of the delegates felt, however, that an issue had been raised between a group of intellectual dilettantes, on the one hand, and men who would "go through," on the other; and they voted accordingly.

La Follette's Withdrawal

La Follette's primary reason for refusing to accept a nomination, according to Gilbert Roe, his spokesman at Chicago, was that the Senator did not think that the assembled groups represented sufficient solidarity of principle or purpose to live through more than the coming election. Subsequent events proved that La Follette was right in his estimate of the forces that imagined they were united to support him when in fact he himself was the only glue that was even temporarily holding them together. La Follette's refusal to run was fortunate for him and even more so for the Farmer-Labor party, in spite of the disappointment that most of its members still feel over his decision. La Follette's withdrawal freed the party from the issue of personality and placed it on a basis of principles, the only sound one upon which to stand. Had La Follette become the candidate, he would inevitably have been the kite and the Farmer-Labor party the tail. We would have seen once more the spectacle of the "good man" in politics, the futility of which, without united support in regard to program, has been so often demonstrated. Had La Follette been defeated, it is doubtful if the party could have weathered another four years; had he been elected, it is probable that disagreement and dissatisfaction in regard to a constructive administrative policy would have disrupted the party within six months. As it is, the Farmer-Labor party has been purged of its chief elements of disunion, and has before it the possibility of building with the cement of a great issue and not the mere glue of an evanescent personality (be it ever so excellent).

Since the convention a good deal has been written of the Farmer-Labor party as a class movement, commonly, of course, purely to discredit it. The American Labor party, it is true, was founded by trade unionists, but its membership is open to all persons doing *useful work*. It should be difficult to arouse much sympathy in America for the political rights of any whom this condition would exclude. The Farmer-Labor party *is* a class

party in the sense that the Socialist party is such: that is, an organization that seeks to replace existing privileged classes with one class based on democratic service to the community. The Farmer-Labor party has been widely characterized also as socialistic. It is true that the platform contains planks in regard to nationalization and democratic control of public resources and utilities, but the fundamental concept of socialism—the elimination of capitalism—is not touched upon.

The Debs Sentiment

All the meetings at Chicago, whether of Forty-eighters, Laborites, or both, showed a warm sympathy for the personality and martyrdom of Eugene V. Debs. Mention of his name never failed to bring cheers, and the convention came closer to nominating him for President than most persons realize, so close indeed that Otto Branstetter, national executive secretary of the Socialist party, appeared before the delegates unofficially and advised that such action would probably embarrass both them and Debs. Even so, on the first ballot Debs received 68 votes to 166 for Dudley Field Malone, 121 for Christensen, and a couple of dozen scattering.

No Room for Liberals

Possibly half of the Committee of Forty-eight will stick by the Farmer-Labor party. Some of the others have announced their intention to continue their organization and to found a liberal party standing between the Socialists and the Farmer-Labor party, on one hand, and the Democrats and Republicans, on the other. We need not detain ourselves long with a consideration of such a party's probable future. Everything points to a great third party in America before many years, but it will not be a middle party. True, the temper of the country is not to any degree radical at this moment, but it is even less responsive toward efforts at half-way or merely political reform. Besides, there is something in the attitude of the average liberal who has arrived at his philosophy through purely intellectual processes that unfits him for party discipline and action. His idealism and critical spirit are useful to the community but not as a builder or director of parties. The Chicago *Tribune* of July 15 said satirically but with a certain bitter truth:

> "There is a traditional conservatism in the intellectuals which reveals itself when theories are turned into direct action. The Girondists were the first victims of the real French revolution. Kerensky and his moderates were the first victims of the real Russian revolution.
>
> "The pinks now in Chicago may think now they have convinced the reds that they are on common ground. The reds know better. They know that the intellectuals are anaemic. They would be embarrassing to revolutionary action. All their bourgeois restraints and traditions would be in the way as soon as the real overturning of the social order was begun.
>
> "What protects the pinks from the reds is the placid majority against which the two combine. This majority will keep the combination from succeeding, and in the lack of success is the security of the pinks.
>
> "Otherwise it is but a step from the parlor to the abattoir."

Future Coöperation

No, the proposed middle party need not delay us long. On the other hand, the organization of a radical farmer-labor movement is of vital concern to the Socialist party, although it is not certain yet that the party recently born in Chicago will prove the eventual vehicle of such a movement. For the present one can only wait and see. But sooner or later such a movement, on a formidable scale, is inevitable. It will reach thousands that the Socialist party, as such, cannot touch, sometimes purely because of prejudice against the name. It will not do for the Socialist party to ridicule or ignore this movement; the radical forces of the country must not be divided. One of socialism's greatest sources of strength is its refusal to yield to opportunism, but intransigeance may degenerate into mere obstinacy or inertia. The new radicalism must be met half way. As in England, there must be coöperation. Somehow, some way, federation or a working arrangement must be devised.

Divisions in Italian Socialism[1]

Girolamo Valenti

My former article described the intimate relation between the Italian Socialist Party and the General Confederation of Labor.

Italian labor has also established numerous producing and consuming coöperatives, federated in the League of Coöperative institutions. This league's strongest producing centers are in Emilia and Romagna, where the workers are organized for building and farm work. In Reggio Emilia the local coöperatives own a small railroad branch built several years ago by their members. The three locomotives on this workers' railroad are named after prominent socialists—Karl Marx, Andrea Costa and Camillo Prampolini.[2]

The largest of the consumers' coöperatives, which are spread over the northern and central parts of the country, are located in Milan and Turin. In the latter city are found coöperative grocery stores, medical laboratories, sanatoria, butcher shops, flour mills, and saloons. It goes without saying that these institutions are operated and controlled by socialists.

Socialist Education

The Italian Socialist party owns various educational institutions. Almost every industrial or agricultural center has its *Casa del Popolo* —People's House—containing night school rooms and halls for meetings and theatricals. There are also numerous orphan asylums and other institutions under socialist direction.

Of all of the socialist publications issued in Italy, only the *Critical Sociale,* the personal magazine of Comrade Turati, is non-party owned. The party organ, *Avanti,* established twenty-four years ago, is the most widely circulated daily in the country. It is edited by Giacinto Menotti Serrati, a very popular socialist, who is also editor of two bi-monthly magazines, *Campagni* (Comrades) and *Comunismo.* (Serrati is known in America as a former leader of the Italian Socialist federation here and the editor some fourteen years ago of its official daily, *Il Proletario*). *Avanti* is published in three editions, in Milan, Turin, and Rome, and has a circulation of nearly half a million. Besides *Avanti* there are the *Guistizia,* a daily of Reggio Emilia, and hundreds of others scattered throughout the country.

The political direction of the Socialist party of Italy is vested in the supreme body of all workers' councils, which has power of control over every proletarian activity, whether in the political, the industrial, the coöperative, or the educational field. The party contains nearly 4,000 branches with a membership of about 125,000, a Women's Socialist league, and a Young People's league, 40,000 strong.

Parliamentary Activity

In the Chamber of Deputies, the Socialist party is represented by 156 deputies out of 508. These vote on a question only after a decision has been reached at a regular meeting of the Socialist Parliamentary group, as their organization is called. Whenever a matter of great importance comes up for decision, the Parliamentary group calls a meeting, to which members of the National Executive committee are invited. Each one of the 156 deputies is required to donate to the party 50 lires for propaganda purposes out of his parliamentary office salary.

Municipal Socialism

Connected with the machinery of the party also is the League of Socialist Municipalities,

---

[1] Mr. Valenti's first article appeared in the August issue of *The Socialist Review.*

[2] A similar enterprise was undertaken by the seamen's unions, who bought five ships from the Italian government after the war, establishing the Garibaldi Shipping Company. The crews are paid union scale and the officers better paid than the average. Like the Emilia engines, the ships of the Garibaldi Company are soon to be rechristened with the names of socialist heroes. Possibly the vessel which navigates the New York line may be called Nicolo Lenin. Its red flag has already appeared in New York harbor.

a union of all cities, towns or villages having a local socialist administration. This league includes most of the 800 socialist municipalities, and has for its object uniform policy in regard to education, taxation and public works. Milan, the moral leader of Italy, Bologna, Monza, Novara, Verona, Alessandria, Reggio and other cities of the first class controlled by the Socialist party, are represented in the league. At times, when the socialist officials of a small city need either technical or financial assistance in working out the problem of the city budget, the administrations of larger socialist cities come to its assistance.

In the past few months the non-socialist press in America has often spoken of the aid given by the Italian people to the starving Austrian children. It has not explained, however, that it was the League of Socialist Municipalities which undertook the humanitarian task of sending committees into Austria to gather the hungry orphans and bring them to the socialist cities in Italy. "Capitalists under the cover of patriotism have caused a war and have deprived you children of your fathers. Socialism, through the city administration of a supposedly enemy country, extends its paternal help to you." Thus spoke the soul of the cities conquered by socialism, and Austrian children by the thousands were taken to those cities and fed and cheered by the workers.

Factions in the Party

At the last national convention of the party in Italy, held in Bologna a few weeks before the general election, three factions came to the fore. Of these the dominant faction at present is that led by Serrati. Serrati, it will be remembered, is the editor of *Avanti,* a personal friend of Lenin's, a deputy in Parliament, and the elaborator of the soviet plan for Italy, which a great majority adopted in April at the last national executive council in Milan.

Serrati's faction includes two-thirds of the party membership. While accepting the political struggle with participation in elections as a means of propaganda and agitation, it urges the party to take advantage of the first opportunity to call the proletariat to arms, and following the revolution, to proclaim a socialist republic, with proletarian dictatorship.

There is a second faction, insignificant in numbers and importance, the so-called abstentionists, led by Amedeo Borgiga and Professor Enrico Leone, who returned to the party after an excursion into the syndicalist field. Like the Serratians, the abstentionists are enthusiastic about a speedy revolution, but do not favor participation of the proletariat in elections, on the ground that such action will lure the proletariat away from its goal and retard the revolution. They are called by some anarcho-syndicalists; by themselves, true Marxists. In reality they stand for the negation of scientific socialist development.

The third faction is led by the old guard, the founders of the Socialist party, organizers and parliamentarians, such as Lazzari, former secretary of the Socialist party and a political prisoner during the war. Other leaders of this group are Prampolini, a Tolstoian socialist, who has spent most of his life in propaganda work and in building up cooperative societies; D'Aragona, general secretary of the General Confederation of Labor; Treves and Modigliani, for many years members of Parliament; and, finally, Filippo Turati, a founder of the Socialist party, and for thirty years a socialist representative in Parliament.

This faction follows the orthodox practices of scientific socialism. Its members contend that the war has not revolutionized the economic and psychological conditions of the world sufficiently to warrant a change in the 1914 socialist platform, which advocated socialism through peaceful evolutionary methods. The evolutionists, moreover, abhor violence in the attainment of their principles, except as an unavoidable result of the class struggle. They are therefore endeavoring to counteract the revolutionary propaganda of the first faction.

Why the Rights are Right

The masses do not follow the right in the belief that they should wait peacefully for capitalism to give up its heritage to socialism through an evolutionary process. The Russian revolution has filled their hearts with hope that capitalism can be cast aside by the mighty force of the working class. They are therefore lining up with the left wingers, waiting for the day of the final struggle.

However, the desires of the masses and of the socialists are one thing. The logic of events in Italy is another thing. And the situation is such as to place the logic on the side of the right wingers.

"Yes," say the latter, "you want a revolution at the earliest possible moment. Are you sure, however, that your revolution will not be crushed before it affirms itself? Have you taken into account the workers of southern Italy? Do you know that they may be used against the workers of northern Italy?"

These are some of the questions which suggest an analysis of the psychological situation in Italy. It should be remembered that Sicily, that beautiful, picturesque island of volcanic human passions, did not send a single socialist deputy to Parliament, and that all of the south from Naples to Apulia e Calabria elected about 6 of the 156 socialist deputies.

It is true, as some left wingers contend, peasants revolt and seize the land in southern Italy. To this the rightwingers reply that they have little use for people who rise to arms one day for the purpose of gaining possession of the land, and who vote the next day for the owners of the land.

After all, the southern peasants, the most inflammable of all Italians, revolt and demand the land not because they are class conscious, but because they want the land for their own selfish use. They are still deeply patriotic. In the last war they went willingly to the trenches, frequently dying with the word "Savoia" (the ruling dynasty) on their lips. The southern Italians are even today under the spell of priests and landlords. Should a revolution break out in Italy, it would not be surprising if the southern landlords started a separatist movement, arousing their slaves against the revolutionary ideas of upper Italy.

The right wingers also put this question to the left: "Would it not be a crime for the socialists to take over the power of the nation at a time when it is starving? Would not the capitalist governments blockade Italy, as they have blockaded Russia and Hungary, if a socialist government were proclaimed?"

These arguments have impressed the people at large, especially when they recall the unfortunate end of the Hungarian revolution. Further proof that an immediate revolution now would be a blunder is indicated in the effort of the ruling class to provoke the proletariat to revolt, because they see that a premature uprising could easily be crushed. The main duty of the party today is to organize and strengthen the masses, particularly in the south.

Anarcho-Syndicalists

Opposed to these opinions, a small group of anarcho-syndicalists, led by Enrico Malatesta and Amando Borghi, the latter the secretary of the syndicalist organization, are aiming at an immediate revolution. They accuse the Socialist party of being the stumbling block, and spend most of their time denouncing the socialists, rather than the capitalists, through the columns of *Umanita Nova,* a small daily edited by Malatesta, and the *Questione Sociale,* edited by the other general.

Malatesta

Since 1872 Malatesta has been preaching immediate revolution. He has taken part in seven uprisings. In June, 1914, he threw himself into the general strike, called jointly by the Socialist party and the General Confederation of Labor, to protest against the killing of several workmen at Ancona. He tried to give the strike a revolutionary character, and called on the working class to seize the power in the cities and proclaim a soviet republic. For a time it seemed as if

Romagna, the home of Malatesta, was under the control of the workers, but the government troops soon arrived and crushed the revolt. Malatesta fled to London, and there began to denounce the socialists for the failure of the strike, on the ground that they had called it only for 24 hours instead of for an indefinite period. "The socialists," he cried, "are firemen, always pouring water on the revolutionary flames."

During the war Malatesta lived unmolested in London. He was a passive opponent of the war. After the armistice the socialists held demonstrations in favor of his return. When, through their agitation, he was admitted into Italy, they received him with open arms. Soon, however, he founded the *Umanita Nova,* and began his attacks. A few months ago in Milan, during a general political strike, controlled by the anarchists, Malatesta and his followers aroused several thousand strikers to a demand for revolution and for indefinite continuation of the general strike for the purpose of "expropriating the capitalists." The following day, despite the Malatesta resolution, the labor leaders called off the strike. The anarchists, enraged, tried violently to prevent the workers from obeying their leaders' orders, and even attempted to destroy the headquarters of the Chamber of Labor. Violent clashes occurred between the socialists and anarchists, and when, three days later, the workers had returned to their posts, Malatesta again denounced the socialists as traitors. "If the results of the anarchist propaganda in Italy will be similar to that which was witnessed in Milan," declared the *Resta del Carlino,* a reactionary daily of Bologna, "it can be said that, to a certain extent, the government need not regard that propaganda as dangerous."

The Future

While irresponsible extremists are crying revolution, the Socialist party is working on a soviet experimental plan and a plan to capture hundreds of additional cities at the next local elections, which will take place before the end of the year. Should the Socialist party again win as large a majority as that obtained in the last general elections, a real proletarian revolution will have occurred.

In the last elections, the socialists of central and northern Italy swept everything before them.[1] It was this victory that caused Nitti to change his Russian policy. If the Socialist party launches a vigorous campaign in the next election, hundreds of cities are likely to be added to the red map, and the proclamation of a Socialist Republic will not be far off.

---

[1] In the Piedmont region, once a stronghold of the Monarchist party, the socialists elected more than two-thirds of the entire number of representatives. In Turin, their vote was far in excess of the combined vote of all of the other parties. In the Milan district, Turati polled 198,341 votes, while his nearest non-socialist opponent received 117,614. In Milan proper the vote stood, socialists, 55,158, all other parties, 45,330. In the province of Perugia, the socialists secured 65,000 out of 110,000 votes, while in the district of Bologna, 7 of 8 elected representatives were socialists. Similar victories were won in many other industrial centers, such as Pavia, Novara, Ferrara, Venice, Verona, Florence, Mantua, Cuneo, Parma, Ravenna, Alessandria, Cremona, etc.

Socialist Review Calendar

JULY, 1920

Compiled by W. Harris Crook

JULY

1	U. S. A. Washington, D. C.	Julius H. Parmelee, Director of Bureau of Railway Economics, declares U. S. railroads have in four months run beyond the $255,000,000 deficit guaranteed by government for six-month period ending September 1, under Esch-Cummins Act.
	CANADA. Winnipeg.	F. J. Dixon, Rev. Wm. Ivens, J. Queen, and G. Armstrong, all leaders of general strike last year, and all but Dixon now in jail for "sedition," elected to Manitoba legislature.

3	FRANCE. Paris.	Letter to *Le Populaire* declares Villain, assassin of Jean Jaurès, acquitted on plea of temporary insanity, now holds government job of secretary to the president of War Casualties Commission at Epernay in the Marne.
4	U. S. A. New York City.	Socialist party nominates Joseph D. Cannon for state governor, Jessie Wallace Hughan for Lieutenant Governor, and Judge Jacob Panken for U. S. Senator.
6	RUSSIA. Moscow.	Wireless reports capture of fortress of Rovno from Poles.
	IRELAND. Dublin.	3,000 dock-workers strike for two hours as protest against imprisonment of James Larkin in United States.
7	U. S. A. Washington, D. C.	State department removes "all restrictions" on trade with Soviet Russia, except shipment of war materials; political recognition of Soviet government not implied, nor is postal service provided or passports granted.
	" Scranton, Pa.	W. Jett Lauck asserts anthracite industry conceals its profits. Declares seven anthracite railroads in collusion should have their books opened to public. Coal operators object.
	" Stamford, Conn.	Yale and Towne, makers of the Yale lock, declare net profits for 1919, after paying charges and federal taxes, of $47.29 a share, nearly double profit of previous year.
8	" New York City.	*Times* reports Armour Company to "cut a melon" equivalent to 100% dividend on common stock. . . . "most of it goes to the family."
	GREAT BRITAIN. Leamington.	Miners' Federation in session resolves to call general strike unless British troops be withdrawn from Ireland, and Britain cease sending munitions to the Poles.
9	JAPAN. Tokio.	Associated Press cable reports great political turmoil in the Diet, with fierce attacks upon the Hara government for its militaristic policy in Siberia and its refusal to grant universal suffrage.
11	POLAND. Warsaw.	City of Minsk captured by Bolsheviki.
12	U. S. A. Chicago.	Judge Hebel, in Communist Labor party trial rules that activities of defendants *prior* to passing of Illinois sedition law, under which prosecution is taking place, can be utilized as evidence.
13	" Scranton, Pa.	Dr. W. O. Thompson, chairman of the Anthracite Mine commission to arbitrate miners' wage demand, rules that commission has no power to admit to record anything that has no direct bearing on the 18 demands of the miners' officials. By this ruling Jett Lauck's demand for presentation of profiteering data to commission and public is denied.
	GREAT BRITAIN. London.	Special Trades Union congress by over million votes resolves upon down-tools policy to compel withdrawal of British troops from Ireland.
15	U. S. A. Chicago.	New "Farmer-Labor party," failing La Follette as presidential nominee, drafts Parley Parker Christensen of Utah (lawyer), with Max Hayes (editor) of Cleveland, O., as vice-president.
17	" Washington, D. C.	New York *Times* correspondent wires "the whole balance of power in Eastern Europe has changed. What is practically nothing less than a defensive attitude is being taken by the Western Powers against the advancing Red Army."
18	" New York City.	Samuel Untermeyer writing to the *Times* asserts "never have percentages of profits or the returns on capital in business been so extortionate."
	IRELAND. Cork.	British armored cars fire indiscriminately into holiday crowds, killing one and wounding many. Civilians retaliate later with bombs.

19	GREAT BRITAIN.	British naval and military operations in Russia from the signing of armistice with Germany to March 31, 1920, amount to $280,000,000.
	CZECHO-SLOVAKIA. Prague.	Martial law declared throughout the land to curb spread of communism.
	RUSSIA. Moscow.	Opening session of 3rd International. Lenin declares world economic crisis and failure of League of Nations are most important factors promoting aims of 3rd International.
20	U. S. A. New York City.	James J. Storrow, Massachusetts Fuel Administrator, alleges before U. S. Senate Committee on Reconstruction that coal operators are making $350,000,000 in *excess* profits annually out of American public.
	" Chicago.	Rail employes receive advance of average of 22% on wages by award of Labor board retroactive to May 1, 1920.
	GREAT BRITAIN. London.	Jewish socialists force adoption of amendment compelling all Zionist settlers to cultivate their own land.
21	U. S. A. Denver, Colo.	Parley P. Christensen, presidential nominee of Farmer-Labor Party, appeals to Cox and Harding to move for Debs' immediate release from Atlanta.
	IRELAND. Dublin.	General strike in protest against U. S. imprisonment of James Larkin.
22	IRELAND. Belfast.	Nine killed in riots and post office wrecked.
23	" "	Kilmallock, nineteen miles from Limerick, wrecked by a body of police, who fired volleys in various parts of the town while inhabitants attempted to extinguish fires raging in their houses.
24	U. S. A. Chicago.	363 out of 375 coal mines in Illinois shut down as result of miners' strike.
	" Marion, Ohio.	Senator Harding, presidential nominee of Republican party, refuses Christensen's request to intervene for Debs' release.
	RUSSIA. Moscow.	Soviet government orders negotiations for armistice between Soviet army and Poles. Red Army reaches Polish borders.
25	U. S. A. New York City.	*Times* reports that International Ladies' Garment Workers Union will undertake manufacture and retail sale of clothing to reduce prices and stabilize employment.
29	FRANCE. Paris.	Berlin wire to *Le Journal* declares Gen. Ludendorff has made offer to Allies to recruit a German army of one and a half million men to fight Bolsheviki, if Allies give back Posen to the Germans.
	" "	Franco-British commission to Poland declares Poland can be saved from Bolsheviki. Orders Polish army put in control of 600 French and 200 British officers. Gen. Pilsudski, Polish commander in chief, opposing their suggestion, resigns.
30	U. S. A. Washington, D. C.	Referendum vote of U. S. Chamber of Commerce gives 1,665 votes in favor of open-shop industry and prohibition of strikes among public utility employes, with only four votes against.
	" "	President Wilson telegraphs John L. Lewis, president of United Mine Workers of America, that Illinois miners must return to work.
	IRELAND. Dublin.	Assassination of Frank Brooke, friend of the Viceroy.
	FRANCE. Paris.	Allies reported as setting limits to Polish peace terms (a) disarmament prohibited; (b) change in system of government forbidden; (c) use of Poland as a bridgehead between Soviet Russia and Germany in any way forbidden.

31 U. S. A. Washington, D. C. Interstate Commerce Commission grants railroads billion and half dollars rate increase. Freight from 25% to 40%. Passenger rates 20%. Pullman service 50%.

POLAND. Warsaw. Polish military delegates meet Soviet emissaries on Brest-Litovsk road, for negotiation of armistice.

Book Reviews

A Colorful World

Color in Everyday Life. Louis Weinberg. N. Y.: Moffat, Yard & Company.

"The main business of art," declared Ruskin, "is its service in the actual uses of daily life." The author has written about color in the spirit of this assertion. He recognizes that color is a force in the world like music, the tides, and the electric current; but it is a limited force, needlessly limited, and capable of infinitely wider application. We are all familiar with this force in a few fields, and particularly in the field of art. But Mr. Weinberg believes that while it is important that color should give brightness and distinction to pictures, it is even more important that color should give brightness and distinction to life.

That the book fully lives up to its title is the first thing to be said about it. For it really does deal with color in *everyday* life. And it deals with this subject in the most effectual way—that is, by answering the questions which puzzle different sorts of everyday people in actual everyday affairs. The lady who wishes to harmonize her complexion with her dress or her muff with her coat; the gentleman who plans a color symphony of hat, suit, tie, and sock; the business man who appeals for customers through the painted poster or the illuminated sign; the theatrical producer who aims to reinforce the tone of a scene with the tone of the scenery; and the mere man of the house who longs for a concord of sweet colors in his living room or study—these and others will find that the author has considered their several problems with keen intelligence and rare dramatic sympathy. "All that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave" cannot explain why one man's color is another man's abomination. But Mr. Weinberg effectively puts at the public service such secrets about color as the analytical experiments of science and the creative arrangements of art have revealed.

It is true that scientists have already recorded many of these secrets in scientific phraseology. But what good is that to the simple layman? For all practical purposes, the facts of color have been locked away in abstruse books as securely as Daphne was imprisoned in a laurel tree. Mr. Weinberg has undertaken the task of releasing the treasure. What the physiologist and the psychologist have learnedly formulated as a result of their most recent researches, he has put into clear and straightforward language for the benefit of the advertiser, the interior decorator, and the painter. Even for the mere lay enthusiast, the book is a veritable treasure trove. Let the plain art lover read Mr. Weinberg's simple explanation of the three dimensions of color, and a trip through the picture galleries with an artist friend will be robbed of all its terrors. No longer need his face assume a look full of woe or his voice give an assent full of guile when the artist talks impressively of the intensities in a Japanese fan or the values in a Cézanne landscape. And gone forever will be his hopeless conviction that the mysteries of light and shade are "wedged whole ages in a bodkin's eye."

It must not be supposed that the book is cramped by a purely utilitarian purpose or philosophy. Quite the contrary. Its constant theme is that an artist can do with hues what a poet can do with words or a composer with sounds—namely, reach the soul through the heightened senses. Indeed, Mr. Weinberg believes that color, because of its never-ceasing manifestations, can be made to fulfil this purpose much more effectually than any rival medium. He points out that the celestial lights, artificial illumination, and painted symbols impinge upon us day and night. And he pleads for an enrichment of life by a systematic orchestration of colors in our streets, our houses, our places of business, and our community buildings.

It is in such matters as this that the book scores its most original points. Not that the author attempts to say the final word on color harmony. Rather, he refuses to admit that there can be a final word. Thus, his attitude towards his subject is a bold and creative one. He holds that no color is in its nature wholly agreeable or wholly disagreeable. And he believes that colors can be creatively organized so that hues which the scientist may have pronounced discordant and mutually exclusive can be brought together in a concordant and satisfying scheme.

In short, the clash of colors is never so absolute that the magic of art cannot resolve the discord into some unexpected harmony. Here, psychologists and physiologists are in duty bound to follow

the artist, precisely as grammarians and rhetoricians must needs follow the creative author in recording the rationale of each new and probably heretical arrangement which his act of genius triumphantly justifies.

Mr. Weinberg takes an equally bold line in regard to the emotional effect of color. The traditional position, established by Goethe, is that every hue produces a specific emotional reaction, red steeping the observer in one mood, indigo in quite another. In direct opposition to this view, Mr. Weinberg asserts that color moods are as numberless as the gay motes that people the sunbeams, and as variable as the infinite changes in value and intensity to which any object is liable. That masters like Whistler and Velasquez owe much of their distinction to a practical grasp of this truth is made clear in one of the most fascinating chapters of the book.

It has already been shown that the book admirably subserves the needs of those who wish to use color wisely or profitably in their dress, their homes, or their business. Quite as admirably does it subserve the needs of the student or the lover of art who is in search of intellectual or esthetic recreation. The man that has no color in his soul may stick to treasons, stratagems, and spoils. The man that has, will be vastly the gainer for acquainting himself with *Color in Everyday Life*. Mr. Weinberg shows him how to acquire both a keener appreciation of nature's subtler color gradations and some skill in applying color lore, besides providing him with a new interest in looking at his surroundings and with a new weapon for making these surroundings more beautiful.

FELIX GRENDON.

A Drive Against Socialism

Socialism vs. Civilization. Boris L. Brasol. N. Y.: Scribner. 1920. 289 pp.

In this volume an attempt is made to summarize the doctrines of Marxian socialism, and to criticize these doctrines both in their theoretical implications and their practical aspects as revealed in the Bolshevist experiences in Russia. Throughout the discussion the major emphasis is placed on the socialistic experiment in Russia, which the author is convinced is the example and proof *par excellence* of the failure and inefficiency of all forms of collectivism.

Judged from a scientific point of view, whether historical or analytical, the volume possesses very little merit. It is replete with unfounded generalizations, and pitiably biased statements concerning the current concepts of socialist philosophy. The author manifests crass ignorance of the general tenets of American socialism and the recent developments in the American socialist movement. Even more conspicuous is the author's lack of real knowledge concerning the American and the British labor movements.

The book is obviously a conscious piece of propaganda against socialism and the progressive labor movement everywhere, and constitutes a feeble attempt to defend modern individualism. The author enlists all the English language he knows in condemning progressivism as dogmatic, but it would be difficult to find a more dogmatic discussion of important social phenomena than this volume presents. Any person who has a high regard for impartial and scientific treatment of a subject will find very little that is valuable in this book. The author has made no contribution to the case against socialism.

G. S. WATKINS.

National Ideals, or Mob Psychology

The Psychology of Nationality and Internationalism. By W. B. Pillsbury. N. Y.: Appleton. 1920.

Any discussion of world problems by an expert in psychology is at present especially welcome, and Professor Pillsbury has established in a readable manner his conclusion that nationality is a permanent force to be reckoned with, but that "in no single respect does the psychology of nationality offer any reasonable objection to the formation of an international society or League of Nations."

Notwithstanding its somewhat questionable elevation of hate to a social force, the volume points out emphatically the triviality of the causes of war, the uselessness of national aggrandizement to the individual, and the artificiality of race antagonism as a cause of conflict.

There are many keen analyses of mass motive and conduct (pp. 42, 127, 144, etc.), and the author shows a not unfriendly spirit toward the socialist and the alien radical.

We tend to test the scientific quality of a writer, however, by his handling of evidence in those fields wherein we happen to be familiar, and from this point of view it is interesting to note the naïveté with which Professor Pillsbury has accepted the data of the man in the street. In face of his own warning that during time of hysteria "one who questions the universality of cruelty among the enemy is not granted a hearing," the author bases serious conclusions upon the crudest stories of German atrocity; and whenever opportunity offers he brings up the Bolshevist government as illustrating "complete freedom, with no restriction by

convention," the robbery and murder of "the rich or the relatively rich before it considers means that shall prevent suffering by the poor or the workman," and the killing of "the kindly with the known despots."

Still more naïve as coming from a psychologist is the pronouncement that "the man of education or position or both is moved largely by ideals."

The most curious failure in observation of facts and in analysis of motive is contained in the author's use of the draft measures of Great Britain and America as illustrating "the motives and compelling force" of national ideals. "In both countries," he states, "the response was direct and immediate, with practicaliy no necessity for resort to compulsion."

Does not Professor Pillsbury class as compulsion the "slacker raids" in both countries and the infliction of sentences more severe than for any crime except murder? Has word never reached him of the ten thousand young men in Great Britain, the thousand or more in our own country, who defied even this compulsion with a defiance unknown since the days of religious martyrdom? Is he ignorant that hundreds of these have undergone literal physical torture, and that now in the third year of the armistice American boys are still paying the price of refusal in military prisons?

The author has indeed supplied us with a valuable illustration of mob psychology in its effect on scientific thought. The question that arises, however, is: Can we trust the data of Professor Pillsbury in matters upon which we do *not* happen to be informed?

JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.

Religion—A Social Phenomenon

The Social Evolution of Religion. By George Willis Cooke. Boston: The Stratford Company. 1920.

The chief value of this work resides in its impartial, coördinating survey of religion as a social phenomenon manifested in all times and all lands. Such chapter headings as "Feudal Religion," "National Religion," "International Religion," Universal Religion," sufficiently indicate the scope of the work. The author's sincerity and truthward purpose must appeal even to him who has been taught that his particular religion is the one genuine article and that people of other faiths are legitimate subjects for proselytism.

The emphatic word in the title is the adjective. The theory of a "collective mind" is advanced and to its activities the origin as well as the development of religion is referred. One may well take issue with this view, for the likelihood is that some primitive person, "far smarter than the rest," chanced upon the most elementary religious idea —it may have been through fear or wonder; communicating this to his fellows it readily became a group notion. The activities of medicine-man and priest would naturally follow; but every addition, every modification—equally with the initial idea—was born in some individual mind. Emotion is contagious and often it is a collective manifestation; but groups do not think collectively. To recite a creed in concert is one thing, to originate its categorical propositions is quite another. Whether it be the Navaho Chants, the Book of the Dead, or the Apostles' Creed, we are doubtless dealing with the structural results of various minds which worked solitarily and serially in time.

One distinct value of Mr. Cooke's work is that it compels the reader to frame a definition of the term "religion." What is the feature discernible in all these religious phenomena? What is the nexus which must appear in any scientific definition? The wealth of material set forth in *The Social Evolution* leaves no alternative: it is the idea of the supernatural, including supernatural concern in the affairs of man's natural life. Any definition which goes beyond this—or falls short of it—fails to serve the purposes of truth. There is, indeed, a new social affirmation in the modern world, but it is not the voice of any religion, and to describe it as such is to trespass on the domain of ethics.

Viewing the whole subject from the standpoint of the sociologist one is left wishing that the author had commented on the historical rôle of religion as a means for controlling the proletariat. Under the management of a priesthood more or less politically affiliated, or a class of political and economic overlords backed by obscurantism, religion has, of course, been a powerful means for securing resignation and obedience.

The general reader may not observe the absence of footnotes and bibliography from *The Social Evolution of Religion,* but the student will be only partially appeased on finding names of authors and titles of books incorporated in the body of the text. However, this is a minor matter compared with the probability that Mr. Cooke's book will awaken wholesome discussion and lure its readers to further study.

ELLEN HAYES.

Watch for the campaign issue of *The Socialist Review.* The October number will contain new and important material on candidates, parties, and issues.

Labor Psychoanalyzed

The Casual Laborer and Other Essays. By Carleton H. Parker. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1919.

This is a collection of four essays, three of which have been previously published. They are here posthumously republished with a somewhat effusive and hero-worshipful introduction by the author's idolizing wife, Cornelia Stratton Parker. We need not doubt that the passing of Professor Parker, when only attaining the height of his powers, was a distinct loss to economic science. His great vitality, pungent style, good humor, psychological orientation, and intellectual penetration fitted him to play an important role in these days of reconstruction of economic theory and practice, and yet one may doubt whether the approach presented in these essays points toward the main source of light and leading for a troubled world.

The first essay, "Toward Understanding Labor Unrest," gives the author's viewpoint and main theoretical contentions. As is now widely understood Parker was a pioneer in the application of the newer psychological concepts of Freudianism and behaviorism to the problem of industrial unrest. As set forth here and in the fourth essay the fundamental contention is that all that man does is in consequence of certain inherited proclivities or instincts which in the last analysis control his conduct. This instinctive basis of conduct is assumed to be essentially unchanged from thousand generations to thousand generations and to be modifiable only slightly, if at all, by life conditions. "Man is a mosaic of original, uneradicable, and unlearned tendencies to action"(3). Consequently, "if the environment through any of the conventional instruments of repression . . . repress the full psychological expression in the field of these tendencies, then a psychic revolt, a slipping into abnormal mental functioning, takes place" (34). With this basis the first essay makes an heroic effort to explain labor unrest as due to "thwarted instincts" and "attendant complexes" and "fixations." Childhood repressions through socially enforced conventions; youthful repressions through "that pseudo-educational monstrosity, the undergraduate university" (56); labor-instinct repressions through monotonous, dirty, or other bad working conditions—these explain labor turnover, casualness and migratoriness, strikes, radicalism, and violence.

One may readily recognize that this viewpoint has some validity without admitting that it is the major explanation. Is not ability to adapt oneself to the requirements of civilization one fundamental test of fitness for life in a civilized community? What the author explains as due to repression may often be better explained as due to simplicity of nature, a lack of power to cope with the demands for plasticity and adjustability made by a complex dynamic community. Many of the repressions of which the author speaks, or similar ones, must have their place unless we are to act on the principle that preparation for life in the modern community requires no training, no discipline, but only the complete freedom idolized by those who would remove every restraint upon the full and free manifestation of the inherent propensities of the organism. "Fear of being out of style" and "fear of not being right" (46) can no doubt be, and often are, too highly developed, but without them in some degree the community as community must cease to exist.

The author tells us that the balked worker either loses his efficiency, drifts about, drinks, and neglects his family, or "indulges in a true type-inferiority compensation and strikes" (49). Yes, but here as elsewhere we have a complete ignoring of the facts of individual differences. Even when interested, there are great differences in intensity and persistency of interest; even when efficient, great differences in efficiency. Which workers as a rule become the casuals, the efficient or the inefficient? The author seems to assume that the same bundle of "unlearned tendencies to action" are to be found *in the same proportions* in every one. But even as individuals differ in rapidity of reaction so they differ in wanderlust and that combination of as yet unanalyzed traits which produce casualness. Parker himself, however, indicates in the second essay one of the most prominent traits, when he reports two studies showing that 25 per cent of casuals were definitely feeble-minded (73). If this fact be coupled with other studies showing correlations between power of attention, persistence of effort, and general intelligence, with Davenport's study of the inheritance of the tendency to wander and the numerous studies of the correlations of low mentality, inferior physique, and low wages, one begins to see that probably the larger part of what Parker explains as due to repression of instincts is due to the positive lack of capacities to cope with life's demands.

As to the Freudian explanation of strikes the author offers only a pet theory but no substantial facts. Is the tendency to strike a manifestation of an inferiority compensation or of the tendencies to fight, to lead, and to follow a leader enumerated in this same essay? To what extent are strikes the blind impulsive rebellion of men suffering from "a definite industrial psychosis," "a stereotyped mental disease," and to what extent are they the deliberate, purposeful action of men who understand that in most social situations the decision rests with the balance of forces, of which

physical force is not unimportant? Who are more prone to strike and threaten to strike, the defeated, unskilled, "balked" laborers or the successful, skilled, well-organized, and "conservative" union? To what extent is the strike and its threat associated in actual practice with extent and type of labor organization, character of leadership, general economic conditions, and to what extent with "mental stress and unfocussed psychic unrest?" (49). To what extent are strikes a healthy manifestation of retained vitality and capacity for new adjustments in the industrial organization? To what extent are they due to the developing norms of industrial democracy rather than to thwarted instincts? All of which is not to say that Professor Parker's viewpoint lacks either interest or a certain validity, but rather to say that instincts have always been repressed since society began, that the character of the repressions varies from time to time and place to place less in essence than in outward form, and that the less capable—or, if you prefer, the less adapted—portion of every community customarily finds the struggle with circumstances more difficult than the more capable.

One further comment must be made on this first essay. There are passages which seem to be merely effusions of visionary idealism, others that smack of mere smartness, and still others that seem mere jumbles of words.

The second essay, "The Casual Laborer," and the third "The I. W. W." may be criticized from much the same angle as the first. These are very interesting chapters, but may not the conclusions be the reverse of true? The author finds that "casualty begets a labor type permanently under normal" (71); "as a class, the migratory laborers are nothing more nor less than the finished products of their environment . . . tragic symptoms of a sick social order" (88); "nurture has triumphed over nature" (89). But he states that fully one-fourth are feeble-minded; in one group 77 per cent were alcoholic; sex perverts were numerous. As to their "army" formed in California to lay siege to the National Capital, the author says, "There were defectives even among the 'officers,' and much of their 'strategy' . . . was curiously like the scheming of small boys. It was impossible to be there and not get a vivid impression of a class inferior, unequal, and with fewer rights than normal American tradition seems to promise to its citizens" (85). Here, again, is it not probable that the main point is not the thwarting environment, but the mental level of the baffled? How many millions of persons reared in similar environments have escaped the awful struggle of these casuals! Is it possible and is it desirable for human ingenuity and the spirit of humanity to devise a social system in which the strong and the capable shall not succeed and enjoy while the weak and the incapable shall not fail and suffer? Is it not true that in every type of society certain types of individuals inevitably enjoy fewer rights than are normal to that society? Moreover it is not the true function of democracy to accomplish the impossible by giving all men equal wealth and ease, but rather to equalize opportunity for the development of individual capacities. We need a great deal of intensive investigation to show the true extent to which the casuals have not had fair opportunities in childhood and youth (fully 50 per cent are native Americans), to show the exact extent to which they are by nature somewhat aberrant in type and therefore incapable of profiting by such opportunities as were afforded them.

The final essay, "Motives in Economic Life," constitutes a notable pioneer effort to isolate basic instinctive tendencies and relate them to economic life. It reiterates and reinforces the theory of the first. The repeated insistence on the unchanged and unchanging nature of man represents no doubt the acceptance by the author of what is one of the most popular anthropological and psychological doctrines of the day. Is it true, or only a convenient unprovable hypothesis from which to makes a new departure in the realm of theory? If it be admitted that in a general way we today have the same instinctive dispositions as our cave ancestors, do we have them in the same proportions and intensities? Do we all today have them equally? If not, inasmuch as they are inherited, may not the next generation show them in somewhat different proportions even from ourselves? It is now obvious that less than one-fourth of those born in this generation produce much over half of the next; suppose this fourth be not strictly at the mode? Moreover the innate propensities, which are the springs of action, may in final analysis prove relatively subordinate to the rational powers of mind, especially in the higher levels of intelligence. Thus we come back to the facts of individual differences.

Goddard reports that only 4½ per cent of 1,700,000 men of the selective draft who were subjected to psychological testing were of Class A, and only 9 per cent were of class B, while 70 per cent showed less intellectual ability than that required to cope with college requirements (H. H. Goddard, "Human Efficiency and Levels of Intelligence"). Putting these facts together, if one wishes to compete with Parker, in finding a basis for pessimism, he may see it, not in the idea that "present civilization is a repressive environment" (164)—for what civilization has not been?—but in the fact of the sterilization of the more capable.

F. H. HANKINS

SOCIALISM ON TRIAL

By MORRIS HILLQUIT

Mr. Hillquit's closing speech in defense of the five Socialists at Albany. It is the kernel of the two-million-word trial covering the party's policies and methods, attitude toward the war, toward Soviet Russia and toward Socialism abroad. The first authoritative presentation of American Socialism since before the war. (*Paper, 50c.*)

THE GREAT STEEL STRIKE; and Its Lessons

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

The story of organized labor's great fight against Garyism. Introduction by John A. Fitch; 300 *pp.* 8 *illus.* (*Cloth,* $1.75; *paper,* $1.00)

WHERE IRON IS, THERE IS THE FATHERLAND

By C. K. STREIT

An incredible revelation of the collusion of German and French iron and steel interests throughout the war recently brought to light in the French Chamber of Deputies. *Illus., Map.* (*Paper, 50c.*)

Enclose 10% additional for postage, or the publisher will ship C. O. D. Agents are wanted to sell these books in quantities on a liberal commission.

B. W. HUEBSCH, INC.
32 WEST 58TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY

Non-Resistance in Industry

Is Violence the Way Out of Our Industrial Disputes? By John Haynes Holmes. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead Company. 1920. 130 pp.

An attempt to apply to the industrial situation of the day the doctrine of non-resistance. The book begins by recounting some of the violent assaults of capital against labor during industrial disputes, and the futility of such efforts in the accomplishment of the ends sought by capital. Violence against labor, according to the author, far from scattering and demoralizing labor, unites it in hate against the oppressor and in the sentiment of love for one another.

The second chapter deals with labor's attitude toward violence. Violence at times occurs in the labor movement. There is the individual terrorist. There is violence during strikes, although "the strike is not in itself to be regarded as a form of violence. . . . For the solemn decision of a group of men to lay down their tools and cease their labor in a given industry is in essence no more an act of violence than the decision of a single man to do this thing. In spite of the quibbles, evasions, and out-and-out denials characteristic of the hysteria of our time, the legitimacy of the strike is everywhere conceded by governments which regard every appeal to force, in either the political or the industrial world, as criminal."

However, the author contends, strikers are now being organized "for warfare against those who hold them in subjection. . . . Which means that at the bottom the strike today is the principle of coercion-coercion of the worker to join the union and the strike, coercion of the employer to yield to an ultimatum of terms, coercion of the whole body of citizenship to the support of labor at the cost of indescribable misery and social peril! . . . I feel the same opposition to those expressions of violence on the part of labor as I feel toward those expressions on the part of capital."

Mr. Holmes, however, states that we should approach violence on the part of labor in a different spirit than that of the capitalist. Labor is but following the example set by capital. It has been suppressed for ages. Those in authority are constantly appealing to force for the attainment of their ends. The workers in their organized activities in modern times have steadily opposed violence in every form, have undertaken to gain their ends by peaceful means. Advocates of violence have always been in the minority in the labor world.

Despite the fact that labor has more excuse than has capital in its attitude, it should not, for its own good, resort to violence. It can win through the conflict of ideas. "An idea, which is an expression of spiritual force, must be a source of power in and through itself, and as a consequence must be able to overcome obstacles and attain ends."

Mr. Holmes then describes what he believes to be the better methods of progress—the exhibition of the spirit of love in industry, the establishment of industrial courts, the development of the coöperative movement, the entrance of labor into politics—with labor organized as the dominant power in politics there would be no need of strikes."

In his last chapter Mr. Holmes scouts the idea that the interests of capital and labor are identical. The book contains no discussion of the distinction between force and violence, nor does it analyze the ethical implications of various kinds of coercion, curiously enough condemning all types of force used in the labor struggle.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Changes of address and renewals should be received by the fifteenth of the month to ensure prompt and correct delivery of the magazine.